

CIVILIZATION *and* ART SERIES

The REVOLUTIONARY
PERIOD

(*The AGE of REASON*)

VOLUME V

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
BROWN LANDONE



BOOKS, INC.
NEW YORK

Contents

England	1
Russia, Prussia, Spain, Italy.....	39
The Netherlands.....	58
The Great Individualist	68
The Legacy	92
The Coming Storm	111
The Revolution.....	148
Napoleon	213

England

WE have seen that the great awakening began in Italy and that its influence spread all over Europe. The opening of the Seventeenth century found all Western Europe responding to an intellectual life which appealed to a larger number of individuals than anything that the world had previously known.

This intellectual awakening was especially widespread in Great Britain. England had produced no great artists but her writers were among the greatest that the world has known even up to the present time. The Elizabethan dramatists displayed a new interest in the lights, shadows and complexities of everyday life and while much of their material was borrowed without apology from earlier romances, many of their conceptions were original. Christopher Marlowe's Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus gave the great German, Goethe, the suggestion which resulted in his matchless drama of Faust. Shakespeare belongs to the Sixteenth century, though his work extended into the Seventeenth.

Sir Francis Bacon, who died in the middle of the Seventeenth century, had done his work toward modernizing the intellectual life of the people. His philosophical work, *Novum Organum*, was published in 1620. It was, as the name indicates, a new instrument or new method, aimed against the exclusive teaching of the philosophy of Aristotle in the schools and colleges, the effort being to divert thought from the useless study of ancient philosophy to the more practical study of nature and science and their relation to mankind. He followed in this the teaching of his ancestor, Roger Bacon, who three centuries earlier had protested against the blind acceptance of the philosophy of Aristotle as the beginning and end of all knowledge.

It was at this same time, early in the Seventeenth century, in the reign of James I, that the King James translation of the Holy Bible was made by a committee of scholars. This was the second and best complete translation of the Bible into English, to which all of the people who could read had access. The King James translation of the Bible is the finest example which we have of the best English of the period and the fact that this translation is still in common use is the best commentary upon its merit. Its formative influence on the English language since its time and down to the present day is immeasurable.

John Milton was born in 1608 in Broad Street, London. All the world knows his *Paradise Lost*, and *Paradise Regained*, which were published some sixty years later. But few realized the importance of his prose writings upon the minds of the people among whom he lived. He was a poet, a musician and a playwright, but what was probably of more importance in his own day, he was also a politician and a voluminous writer upon political subjects. During the troublous times of friction between Charles I and the Parliament, Milton wrote a treatise upon the limitations of monarchs, and under Oliver Cromwell he held the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs. He also wrote upon divorce, maintaining that it was justifiable on grounds of incompatibility, a plea that we have been accustomed to regard as very modern.

We find expressed in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, the general interest which all shared in regard to the doctrine of the fall of man and life beyond the grave. Changing religious beliefs and a general seeking after truth made this subject one of never failing interest. So great was the intolerance of all religious sects toward each other that many individuals were driven to extremes of unbelief and became vague and confused in their religious ideals.

Milton also wrote on what we now call the freedom of the press. This freedom was then

unknown and its lack was a great handicap to the writers of his time, and to free public discussion of vital subjects. The most harmless comment might be considered heresy against the Church, or treason against the king, and the writer might be imprisoned or even put to death for expressing an honest opinion. There were at the close of the Seventeenth century, in addition to many pamphlets which were distributed secretly or sold openly, a few weekly newspapers or gazettes in Paris and London containing a mixture of politics and court gossip, usually of a slanderous nature.

Fear of arrest made many of the writers conceal their identity under the names of classical heroes and heroines and write their slander in the forms of lampoons or allegories. Ladies and courtiers read these gazettes eagerly, for though all feared to see their own vices exposed, they were eager to read about other people and curiosity conquered fear.

This literature and the opening up of avenues of knowledge to the people at large created a mental activity even broader than that which had brought about the earlier changes in religious beliefs. People began to think for themselves, not only about religious subjects, but about politics, the relation of the individual to the state and the right of the individual to have a voice in government and to conduct his own affairs to please himself.

There was no idea of democracy at that time, comparable to our present understanding of the word, but people were beginning to think for themselves and action followed thought.

England had never been in theory an absolute monarchy, though various kings had occasionally appropriated absolute power to themselves, but the power of the monarchs was steadily more and more hedged about because of their endless need for money. Their only method of obtaining money was through Parliament and their only method of bargaining with Parliament was the relinquishment of some of their rights in exchange for a Parliamentary grant of cash.

Queen Elizabeth assumed practically absolute power, but she was clever in making herself popular with her people, and while positive and dictatorial with her courtiers, the people never chafed under her yoke and she had the diplomacy never to boast of her power. James I lacked this diplomacy. He was the first of the European monarchs to crystallize into words the theory of the divine right of kings. The son of Mary Queen of Scots, and known in Scotland as King James IV, he united England and Scotland under a single king, although there was continued friction between the two countries for a century later.

James was a man of considerable learning and insisted on writing treatises and giving speeches

setting forth his theories as to the absolute power of kings. His idea was that the power of the king came direct from God and was therefore not to be disputed by traditions, laws or people, for to do so would be treason against God himself. He was as fair and just as most kings in his actual government but he talked so much about his power that he roused the people against the theory of divine right and caused many disputes between the English Parliament and the king, not only during his own reign but during those of his successors.

James wrote a book entitled *The Law of Free Monarchies*, in which he said: "As for the absolute prerogative of the crown that is no subject for the tongue of a lawyer, nor is it lawful to be disputed. It is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do . . so it is presumptuous and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or say that a king cannot do this or that. . . He is overlord of the whole land, so he is master of every person who inhabiteth the same, having power over the life and death of every one of them; for although a just prince will not take the life of one of his subjects without a clear law, yet the same laws whereby he taketh them are made by himself and his predecessors; so the power flows always from himself."

Unfortunately for the kings of England, they were not the only people of the Seventeenth

century who were beginning to set down their thoughts and ideas in writing. The public mind was open and eager for learning and for a clearer understanding of the relation of the individual to the life of the country as a whole.

Englishmen had always been jealous of their freedom and independence and the kings had never enjoyed the absolute power of the kings of France and Germany, where the king could levy taxes and pass laws at his pleasure without consulting any other power.

The authority of the king was limited by Parliament, in England. At the time of the accession of James, the king was not supposed to borrow money or impose taxes without the consent of Parliament. The laws were also originated by Parliament, though the king had the power of veto. James I, however, claimed absolute power and borrowed money and imposed taxes at will. As he was just in most things he and his Parliament did not come to an open break, but his policy laid the foundation for trouble between future kings and the Parliament. Whenever Parliament refused to let James borrow more money he secured it by selling a title. He created a new honor for this purpose and many of the noble families of England can trace their titles to the greed of King James.

His constant antagonism to Parliament paved the way for the difficulties his son Charles I

was to have. Charles married a French princess and adopted his manners from the French court, which then represented the highest culture in Europe. Unlike his father, he was a good looking man and decked himself out with the greatest luxury. His hair, which he wore long, was carefully curled, his beard was pointed and small and his mustache upturned. A portrait painted by the Dutch artist Van Dyck shows him with a broad brimmed, plumed hat placed jauntily on the side of his head, high spurred boots and lace collar and cuffs on his velvet doublet. His sword is swung at his side, he has gauntlet gloves and carries a stick. More even than his father, he exaggerated the formal French manners of the time, painting his cheeks and kissing his courtiers.

Even at this time Parliament was divided into the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The House of Commons, chosen by the people, was especially objectionable to Charles. Most of its members were Protestants, and though at first King Charles tried to keep friends with all of the religious sects, he was really in sympathy with those who were Catholics like his French wife.

Charles was desirous for military glory and tried to prosecute two wars, one in aid of the Protestant Huguenots in France and one an expedition against Cadiz, where he hoped to capture the Spanish treasure ships arriving from America. The

English people felt no real interest in these expeditions and to conduct them he borrowed a great deal of money without any apparent intention of ever paying it back. Several men who refused to lend were cast into prison without trial.

These outrages caused Parliament to frame what is known as the Petition of Rights. This stated that no man should be compelled to make any gift or loan, or pay any tax, and that no freeman should be imprisoned without a legal trial. The king reluctantly signed this, which only restated what had for years been considered the limitations of the English kings.

Shortly after this Charles again took the law into his own hands. He dissolved Parliament and ran the government to suit himself. For eleven years he ruled alone, imposing all sorts of unfair taxes on the people.

There were at this time many religious factions in England; the Catholics, the Episcopalians who believed in many of the Catholic forms but rejected the leadership of the Pope, the Presbyterians who were followers of John Calvin, and the Separatists who believed in the independent, democratic organization of each church community. These last came to be called the Puritans. The government forbade them to hold their meetings, which they called conventicles, and in 1600 some of them had fled to Leyden, Holland, and from there in 1620

the Mayflower set out with the colonists who founded New England in North America. The expulsion of the Puritans from England had no effect whatever in diminishing or checking the constantly developing freedom and independence of thought and belief.

Charles became involved in war with Scotland in 1640, which was caused by his effort to force high church bishops of his own appointing on the Scotchmen, who were for the most part Presbyterians. He could not carry on this war without money and in his extremity he was forced to recall the Parliament which he had dissolved eleven years earlier.

No sooner was Parliament again in session than it began to undo much of the work of King Charles. It executed some of his ministers for treason, passed a law providing that Parliament should meet once in three years, whether summoned by the king or not, and did so many things for the good of the people and the displeasure of the king that he gathered troops about him and started a civil war. The followers of Charles were called Cavaliers and included most of the nobility, together with those of the House of Commons who followed the high church and feared that the Presbyterians, should they attain to power, would restrict all religious observance. The opposing faction was led by Oliver Cromwell. They were stern, hard, psalm-singing men, who were called Roundheads because

of their close cropped hair, a protest against the long curled locks and everything of the sort affected by the aristocracy.

Oliver Cromwell had been a member of the king's Parliament. He was untitled, apparently an ordinary country farmer, and while his religious views were narrow, he had the good of the people at heart. The Scotch aided Cromwell, and King Charles was eventually captured, imprisoned and finally executed. The followers of Cromwell then declared that there was to be neither king nor House of Lords. The House of Commons, chosen by the people, with Cromwell at its head, was to be the sole ruling power of England. The new Commons proved to be no more immune from bribery or corruption than the House of Lords had been, but Cromwell by his strength of character and sincerity of purpose maintained justice such as England had never known before. His work was not easy. Royal sympathizers, first in Ireland and then in Scotland, made war on him to put Charles II, the son of Charles I, on the throne of England.

Another of the wars of Cromwell's time must be mentioned because it shows how national ideals and interests had changed. The war between England and Holland was the first purely commercial war in the history of Europe. Holland and England had both attained considerable commercial importance. The ships from Amsterdam and Rot-

terdam were at that time the best trading vessels in the world and had secured control of the carrying trade between England and the American colonies. England did not like this and the Navigation Act was passed, which provided that only English vessels might bring goods to England, unless the goods were brought in vessels belonging to the country which produced them. In the war which followed Holland was defeated. Cromwell also made an alliance with France against Spain and in the commercial war which followed won the island of Jamaica for England, thus laying the foundation of her West Indian colonies.

The Commons not agreeing among themselves, a majority of the House made Cromwell Lord Protector of England, an office which he held to the time of his death. His son Richard succeeded him but resigned in a year. There followed the restoration of the House of Stuart, but thanks to Cromwell's influence and the basic traits of the English people, Charles II came to the throne with rather well defined ideas as to what a king might or might not do with impunity in England.

Charles II believed as fully as had his father in the divine right of kings but the people had been educated by the justice and tolerance of Cromwell's leadership and Charles II knew that he would have to show at least a nominal respect for Parliament. His reign was marked by increased restrictions put

upon the Puritans and by a renewal of Cromwell's wars with Holland, which resulted in increased territory for England in the West Indies and in the annexation to English colonies of the Dutch New Amsterdam in North America.

John Bunyan, 1628-1688, might be looked upon as a representative Puritan of his time. He was the son of a tinker; he early showed a tendency to be introspective and over-critical of himself; he served in the Parliamentary army. After severe mental trials amounting almost to hallucinations he became a Baptist minister and was thrown into Bedford jail and kept there for the greater part of twelve years in an effort to muzzle his preaching. While in prison he began the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the most copied book in the English language except the King James Bible; the most perfect allegory in any language. It made little impression at first but soon began to attract and went into edition after edition. Later he wrote *The Holy War*, which is only surpassed by the *Progress*. Both are rich in imagination and imagery, correct in characterization and in language which is direct and clear, models of the power and force, the simplicity and effectiveness of Anglo-Saxon language.

One might think that during all these years the condition of the common people would have been much improved over what it was during the feudal days of the Twelfth and Thir-

teenth centuries, but while there was a change in theory the actual comfort of the peasants was but little increased.

Serfdom had been almost entirely abolished, not by a radical but by a slow development. Land had increased in value as population increased, making it necessary to secure a higher degree of cultivation. Feudal lords no longer coined their own money, but there was one coinage, that of the king, for the entire country. The nobles soon found it more advantageous to accept a monetary payment of rental for their land, than the old service and share of produce which had formerly been paid. In England, where the nobles had a taste for country life and remained a great part of the time on their own estates administering their own affairs, these rentals paid by the peasant farmers were quite often moderate and fair, but the farmers were ignorant, not one in five hundred or more being able to read or write, and they made little progress. They lived in rude, ill-lighted, unventilated huts and knew little of the world except as it appeared around their own doorsteps. Their chief intercourse with the world was through the county fairs, where they sometimes saw strolling minstrels, jugglers and acrobats. The lord still controlled all the wild game on the land and could arrest a peasant for poaching if he snared a hare or shot a deer.

The condition of the common people in the cities was little better. The streets were narrow, crooked and dirty; the ill-lighted houses were crowded close together. There were very few public conveyances. People of wealth, of course, had coaches drawn by horses and there were also sedan chairs carried by servants. In the Eighteenth century there were a few of these coaches and chairs which might be hired by the public, but for the most part people were compelled to walk unless rich enough to have their own horses. Sanitation was unknown and London was repeatedly visited by disastrous plagues, the most notable of which occurred in 1665.

The guilds which had at first been so helpful in advancing the trades, had by this time become objectionable organizations in restraint of the very thing which they had at first been formed to promote. They made rules limiting the number of master workmen in each trade. They made the period of apprenticeship long and when the apprentice graduated he became a journeyman. That is, he could work for master workmen for wages but he was not allowed to become a master workman, to work for himself and sell the product of his toil, so long as the number of master workmen allowed by the guild was complete. A journeyman who was caught working as a master was deprived of his tools and imprisoned.

The condition of women at this time presented wide contrasts. The women of the peasant class worked side by side with the men in the fields. They had few pleasures and fewer advantages of an educational kind. The ability to read and write was rare among men and rarer among women. In every home the greater part of the clothing was made by hand by the women, who spun the wool and flax, and even in homes of some wealth there was work which kept the women busy from dawn to dark.

Among the women of the leisure class, especially those living at court, there was very little to do except dress, which they did with great splendor. They wore corsets, made in two pieces, often of steel, which were laced very tightly in the middle to give the extremely slender waist which was considered a mark of gentility. These corsets were so very tight that they easily explained the ease with which women fainted upon the slightest provocation. They made elaborate use of rouge, powder and perfumes and were proportionately sparing in soap. These women usually had a smattering of education gained from private tutors. They did embroidery and some of them even spun, especially the ladies of the country estates who had no court duties to perform. Some went hunting with hawks and hounds but there is no mention of their having played tennis, which was even then popular among the men.

There was no wide diversity of fabrics from which clothing could be made for ordinary folk. The common people dressed largely in woollen clothing, for cotton had not yet become common in Europe. Linen was, of course, made from flax in Ireland, but the nobility dressed for the most part in silk, velvet and furs brought over the Channel from the Continent.

It must not be thought that during these days of poverty for the common people and of idle luxury for the rich, progress was dead. Then, as in every age, between the two extremes were men of intelligence working for the good of humanity. While the ignorant tradesmen were hampering their own progress by laws prompted by fear and jealousy, and while the court was amusing itself with immoral drama and trying to make the lavish use of paint and perfume make up for the lack of daily bathing, important scientific discoveries were in progress.

Francis Bacon had set the example. He had started on the right track by turning the minds of men from the past, to experimentation with the ever present forces of nature.

Galileo in the Sixteenth century had discovered by means of his little telescope that the sun was turning on its axis, and thus revolutionized the entire conception of the universe; and it is notable that in the very year of his death, Sir Isaac

Newton, the English scientist, was born, to carry on his work in the Seventeenth century. He discovered the law of gravity and how the same force which held us to the earth, held the earth in its relation to the sun.

Governments began to take an interest in the development of science and to found societies for its study. There was no English art of any moment at this time, and for some years after Shakespeare and Bacon there was no literature of large importance. One man, however, did live and write whose work has thrown much light upon the living conditions of the time, though it has never been considered important as literature. This man was Samuel Pepys, born in 1633. He was the son of a London tailor and was a member of Cromwell's House of Commons. Between the years 1660 and 1669 he kept a diary in a sort of shorthand devised by himself. In this diary he set forth the minutest details of his daily life. It has been published and furnishes the best picture of the times which it is possible to get. He was interested in everything, a gossip, a man about town, a collector of ballads, and founded a library at Cambridge known as the Pepysian Library.

Another man whose work still lives and is in fact in daily use was Henry Purcell, who was born in London in 1658. As a child he was a singer in the choir of the king's chapel. He composed

several anthems before he reached the age of eighteen, when he became organist of Westminster. He composed a number of operettas and a complete service of church music, much of which is still used. It is easy to see how England rather than any other country of Europe produced this great composer at this time. The Catholic Church, already well established in form and service, offered little opportunity for the introduction of new music; the Reformed Churches all over Europe were austere in their worship, but in England the Episcopal Church, while not acknowledging the headship of the Pope or retaining the old observance of the mass, still wished to keep up the ceremony and beauty of the Catholic faith. To do this a new ritual and new music must be provided, and these needs presented the necessary opportunity for the genius of Purcell.

One of the great factors for enlightenment in England was the newspaper. It was a development of the news sheets and news letters which were known in the late Fifteenth century. These letters were first written and passed about and were not sold or distributed to the general public. Later the news letters were printed and the publishers secured a number of patrons and sent duplicates of the same letter to each patron. During the Sixteenth century a court censorship was instituted and only those authorized by the court were per-

mitted to print or circulate news letters. In the latter part of the Sixteenth century this censorship was to some extent lifted and anyone could print news letters so long as they did not contain anything that could be considered treasonable.

In the Seventeenth century, in the reign of Queen Anne, came the first successful daily newspaper in England, the *Daily Courant*. It was at this time, too, that a great number of famous essayists, poets, pamphleteers and novelists rose in England, who were glad to use the newspapers as a means of conveying their messages to the public.

In February, 1704, Daniel DeFoe, the humorist, who is best known by his adventure story, *Robinson Crusoe*, started his paper, the *Review*. He was at the time in Newgate prison for some political offense. Some of the subsequent numbers were issued while he was traveling, but he never missed a week. He published a monthly supplement which he called *Advice from the Scandalous Club*, in which he discussed literature, manners and politics. Later this supplement was separated from the *Review* and published twice a week as the *Little Review*. In this same vein the *Tattler* was started by Richard Steele in 1709, and Joseph Addison founded the *London Spectator* in 1711.

Addison was the son of a rector and an Oxford graduate. His first writings were in Latin, which still commended itself to men of learning as

the language of culture, but as he grew older and became interested in the politics of his country he saw the need of writing in English, and in that language most of his work was written—essays, poems, satires, political articles and even dramas.

Richard Steele was the son of a lawyer. He and Addison were born in the same year and were lifelong friends and co-workers, on both the *Tattler* and the *Spectator* as well as other papers that followed these. Steele made a reputation as a writer of comedies before he began to work as a journalist and political writer. It was his aim to combine wit and humor with a morality and decency of treatment which up to that time had found few advocates on the stage of England or any other country.

Dr. Johnson and Henry Fielding were both editors and there was still much of the best literature of the time to be found in the daily papers. John Dryden, poet, dramatist and essayist, and John Locke, who preceded Joseph Addison as a moulder of public opinion, belong to the latter part of the Seventeenth and the early part of the Eighteenth centuries.

Jonathan Swift, one of the world's greatest satirists, was unique in English literature. As a young man he was embittered by poverty and dependence upon relatives, and this spirit of resentment and protest influenced his whole life and

clouded all of his personal relations. He became the associate of Pope, Addison and Steele, the companion of men of influence and himself a recognized political power.

Gulliver's Travels, his most popular work, was written in 1726, and was at first accepted as a narrative of actual adventures. According to the author it was written "to vex the world rather than to divert it," but like its author, posterity has looked upon its lighter, more diverting side. What was intended as a criticism of social conditions of the time has come to be a classic for children.

These writers of everyday affairs, practical and modern, yet combining wit and culture in a way to appeal to the people, brought about a great unity of thought in England. They did much to dispel the petty religious and political bickerings of the time and to turn the minds of the people to things of real importance.

With them came Alexander Pope, the poet, and at the same time the romantic novels of Samuel Richardson and his parodist, Henry Fielding, appeared. Later came Tobias Smollet with his adventure novel, Roderick Random, containing in it something of the feeling of the romantic literature of Spain; Oliver Goldsmith with his sentimental novel The Vicar of Wakefield, and Lord Chesterfield and Horace Walpole with their cosmopolitan and aristocratic literature.

Here was variety to suit every taste, and men gathered at the coffee houses all over England to read and discuss. Thus even the commonest man, if he possessed the ability to read, could reap benefit from the greatest minds of the times, and in spite of taxes and arrests, the freedom of the press increased and with it people's understanding of each other, and that tolerance of differing beliefs which is the greatest factor in building a foundation for progress and civilization.

This increase in individual thinking, combined with the influence of the Flemish painter Van Dyck, produced the English portraiture of the Eighteenth century.

IN considering the growth of art in England, it is necessary to study the life and work of Anthony Van Dyck, 1599-1641, who though a foreigner spent so great a part of his life in England and painted so many portraits of English men and women that he seems almost as much English as Dutch. He was born in Antwerp, where the name is a common one and little is known of anything but his immediate family. When he was only nineteen years old he became a full member of the Antwerp Guild of painters, but before that time it is known that he painted pictures which commanded attention and secured good prices.

In spite of the quality of this early work, the artist had not at that time found himself. His early pictures, devoted to religious subjects, are ordinary in concept and lacking in force and dramatic quality. It was when he turned to portraiture that his talent shone brightly and it is well for English art and English history that he so soon discovered himself and was so steadfast in the exercise of his gift. His influence was so marked that English art is known more for excellence in portraiture than for any other quality. He was the model of a long line of English portrait painters of great ability and may with justice be looked upon as the founder of the national school of painting in England.

Historically his paintings are of great value. Any portrait belongs to posterity. Aside from being the likeness of an individual it is the record of a more or less fleeting period of time. Van Dyck painted with distinction. His painting of the notable personages of his time was full of side lights upon manners and conditions which the dexterity of his brush work puts before us most vividly.

Van Dyck made many visits to England, the first in the reign of James I. He was granted a pension, given a leave of absence, and recalled by the direct command of the king. Later he was knighted and eventually he took up his residence in London, presumably for financial reasons, for

there his portraits commanded a higher price than on the continent.

It was in the reign of Charles I that he rose to the greatest popularity in England. Charles increased his pension, though there is no record of his having renounced his foreign citizenship.

Van Dyck eventually married an English woman, Lady Mary Ruthven, and at his death he was buried at old St. Paul's where Charles I had an inscription placed upon his tomb. His pictures of the English aristocracy are more than portraits; they show the rich dress of the time and the faces express much of the pride of race and social intolerance of the age. At his best he ranks with Raphael, Titian, Rembrandt and Hals, a goodly company.

His influence on an art kindred to his own was potent. He etched a few plates which are beyond criticism, proofs from which are to-day the delight of connoisseurs. Just as important to the spreading of his influence, he made many cartoons and sketches for engravings and constantly exerted himself to induce others to engrave copies of his paintings as well as those of other masters, even spending his own money to employ engravers to do work that he was in no wise directly interested in.

One other painter of the time deserves mention, for he carried on the tradition of Van Dyck

and in an occasional picture rivaled him. He was the Dutchman, Peter Van der Vaes, 1617-1680, who assumed the name of Le Lys or Lely from the sign of a lily upon the house in which he was born. He was knighted in England and is known to us as Sir Peter Lely, court painter of Charles II. The general quality of his work bears no comparison to that of Van Dyck but his series of portraits of the ladies of the court of Charles II, known as the Windsor Beauties, is of artistic and historical value. His drawing of both figures and draperies was good, his coloring rich and brilliant, but he was not strong in indicating forceful character and was inclined to introduce weak and sentimental allegories. Like every successful portrait painter, he was fond of company and success socially. Pepys several times mentions him in his illuminating accounts of the doings of the day.

The Eighteenth century in England produced Gainsborough, Reynolds, Romney, Raeburn and Lawrence, all notable and individual but all showing the influence of Van Dyck.

Thomas Gainsborough, 1727-1788, began to sketch and paint when still a boy, his earlier work being in landscape. He married at twenty and took up his residence at Bath, which was at the time the resort of fashion and wealth of all England. Here he met everyone and by his tact and charm attracted to him many sitters who were at the time making

their mark in English life and letters. These people not only advanced his reputation but enabled him to multiply his prices, until they would seem respectable to-day, and enabled him to move to London and live in a style that would attract to him those upon whom his success depended. Benjamin West, an American, was court painter at the time and Gainsborough soon shared with him and Reynolds the artistic honors of court and town. There he became one of the thirty-six original members of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts when it was founded in 1768.

Gainsborough was pre-eminent in the matter of perfect likeness in his portraits. As a landscapist he was not successful in interesting others, although his own interest in this branch of the art was so great that his studio was overrun with his paintings of English scenes. The time was one of personalities. The individual was increasing in importance in politics, art, literature and on the stage, so the painter of talent had little encouragement in anything but portraiture. To-day his landscapes have many admirers.

He was English through and through, but there is a delicacy of touch, a sensitiveness to fine gradations of color and an insight into feminine character which we have come to think of as characteristic of the finest French portraiture. He painted many notables, among them the authors

Sterne and Richardson, and Mrs. Siddons, the great tragic actress, but his two most famous canvases are the portraits of Master Buttall, commonly called The Blue Boy, and that of Lady Ligonier, the Duchess of Devonshire. The artist shows absolute mastery in this painting. The fleeting expression, the sense of momentarily arrested movement, the delicacy of the coloring, all go to make it entirely satisfying, one of those rare things that are beyond all criticism. He is credited with about three hundred paintings, two hundred and twenty of which are portraits.

Joshua Reynolds, 1723-1792, was born in Plympton Earl, in Devonshire. He began drawing before he learned writing and at an early age was apprenticed to Thomas Hudson, a popular portrait painter, whose only present bid for fame is that he was the art instructor of Reynolds. Reynolds was under the instruction of Hudson for two years in London, when he returned to Devonshire, where he met another artist named William Gandy, who influenced him much more than did his former master, for Gandy had his art from Van Dyck, through his father, who was a pupil of the famous Flemish painter. Thus was Van Dyck's direct influence continued long after his death, while his indirect influence was exerted through his pictures. Reynolds learned, from Gandy, the method of painting flesh so much admired in his work.

The peaceful quiet of the countryside is no location for a portraitist. Reynolds was soon back in crowded London. He was introduced by Hudson to a circle of artists who met at an inn called Old Slaughters, in St. Martin's Lane, and his career really opened before him but he was by no means satisfied. Italy was calling him and finally, through the kindness of the captain of a British man-of-war, he journeyed there, spent two years in Rome and several months in visiting the Italian cities.

He returned to London brimming over with enthusiasm for the Italian masters, particularly Michael Angelo, whom he considered the supreme figure in art, and Correggio, whom he admired as a master of light and shade.

Hudson and other London painters visited his studio, saw his work and found it unconvincing. Nevertheless, his studio was soon crowded with the wealth and fashion of London, for aside from his ability as a painter, and even more necessary for immediate success, he was gifted with a kindly manner and magnetic personality which attracted acquaintances and held them as friends. This friendliness was his greatest characteristic. It led him to found the Literary Club in 1764. Dr. Johnson, Oliver Goldsmith, Laurence Sterne and Garrick, the actor, and other notables of the time were members of this club and often met around the artist's

dinner table. When the Royal Academy of Fine Arts was founded in 1768, it was but natural that his popularity should land him in the presidency. It was at the annual meeting of the Academy that he delivered the series of addresses which we know as the Discourses, papers of literary excellence and soundness of artistic judgment with which every student of art should be familiar.

The Presidency of the Academy led to knighthood and eventual appointment as painter to the king, and as Sir Joshua Reynolds we know him. His life from the time of his final settlement in London to his death was filled with work and friendship.

His method was careful and painstaking. It had none of the dash and brilliancy of talent. His results came from the patient toil that was insistent upon nothing but the best. The sojourn in Italy was his great experience. From that time on his work shows a mastery of drawing, a largeness of conception, a knowledge of light and shade and a richness of color never known previously in English painting. He was the pre-eminent master of English portraiture, a branch of painting in which the English have been particularly successful. Others painted some pictures which were particularly good. Reynolds painted many such. His best work is seen in his portraits of men, Lord Heathcote, Dr. Johnson, Sterne, Gibbon, Goldsmith, Burke, Fox

and Garrick. His portrait of Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse is expressive, not only of his work, but of the age when drama had taken its place beside literature and painting.

The story of George Romney, 1734-1802, is an antithesis of that of Reynolds. Romney did not have an opportunity to study painting until he was nineteen, and then he was apprenticed to a strolling artist of little talent under whom there was no hope of progress. At the age of twenty-two he went to London to study and later had a little further opportunity in Paris. He became very popular in London, gained a big income by his painting and for a time rivaled Reynolds, but only for a time, for his flashes of brilliancy and inspiration could not compare with the persistent flame of Reynolds' steady application.

He had much talent but lacked self-control and steadfastness of purpose and was handicapped by lack of early and basic training. His female portraits are charming, combining sweetness and grace with distinction, and justify his being ranked third among the great English portrait painters of the Eighteenth century, after Reynolds and Gainsborough. It has been justly said that his talent expressed itself in spite of technique and temperament.

Sir Henry Raeburn, 1756-1823, may be classed as an artistic equal of Romney, and second

to Reynolds and Gainsborough. He was an orphan of Edinburgh, educated in a public institution, not an auspicious beginning in those days. At fifteen the authorities apprenticed him to a jeweler, and there are still in existence rings which he made, decorated with minute ivory carvings. He took up the making of miniatures for himself and meeting with encouragement, turned his hand to oil painting. Never was an artist more completely self-taught. His master, the goldsmith, gave him every encouragement, but his freedom came from another source. A rich young widow whose portrait he painted fell in love with him. They were married and went to London with the intention of going to Italy for study. In London, Raeburn met Sir Joshua Reynolds, who was much attracted to him, offered him money which was not needed, and gave him letters of introduction to men in Italy who proved to be of great service. He remained in Italy two years and on returning resisted the fascination of London and settled in Edinburgh, where most of his painting was done and where there is still a large collection of his paintings. The boy of the orphanage became the greatest Scotch painter.

It is a common criticism that Raeburn was not so successful with female portraits as with male, but it is not a just criticism. His portraits of men are good but so are his portraits of women. His painting is simple and reserved. In handling of

neither light or color was he great but Raeburn was a man of refined tastes, a gardener, a student of architecture, a kindly man, in short a gentleman, and his pictures are portraits of ladies and gentlemen. The other English portrait painters painted pictures of notables and grand dames, sure of their superiority and proud of it. Raeburn painted likeable pictures of likeable people.

His works, as well as those of the other great English portraitists, were largely copied by the mezzotint engravers of the time, mezzotint engraving being an art belonging peculiarly to the English people, so much so that in France it was called "*La maniere Anglaise.*" The distinguishing charm of mezzotint engraving was its richness of tones and its likeness to painting in black and white; its chief defect lay in the fact that the soft copper plates used would permit the making of only a few copies before the plate was rendered useless.

It was an exquisite art which lent itself to most satisfying reproductions of paintings. Its range of tone is as wide as the difference between blackness and light. The painters of the time recognized its beauties and its practical value, for Reynolds said, "By this man I shall be immortalized," when he saw McArdell's mezzotints of some of his earlier paintings.

In our cursory review of the great English portrait painters we have passed by a name unique

in the history of art, to whose possessor we are indebted for a larger knowledge of the social life of his times than any other person. William Hogarth, 1697-1764, whose knowledge of human life and experience rivaled that of Shakespeare, seems to have had a most uneventful career. His own opinion of his talent is given in the words, "Shows of all sorts gave me uncommon pleasure when an infant." He was first apprenticed to an engraver on silver and when his apprenticeship was finished set himself up as an engraver of plates for coats of arms, shop bills, print sellers and book illustration. This was all hack work, for the artist had not yet found himself. He finished the paintings of *The Harlot's Progress* in 1731 and his engravings from the paintings were published in 1733. "I wished to compose pictures on canvas, similar to representations on the stage," he said; and again, "I had endeavored to treat my subject as a dramatic writer; my picture is my stage, and men and women my players, who by means of certain actions and gestures are to exhibit a dumb show."

The Rake's Progress came in 1735 and it is interesting to know that this series was protected by the first copyright in England, put through Parliament at the instigation of the artist to protect his work from piracy. *Marriage a la Mode*, *Industry and Idleness*, and many other series followed, and he also tried his hand at portrait painting.

As a painter he now ranks high. He was honest, direct and simple. His coloring was harmonious and his compositions particularly effective. These qualities appear in his engravings, in all of which he strove for charity and understanding rather than for beauty, but it was as a moralist that he should be judged, and as a satirist and moralist he was unique and outranked by no Englishman. He did for the society of his time in England what Molière did for the society which surrounded him in France.

While the English general public did not enjoy much of the benefit of her great artists, very few people were excluded from the influence of her literature, and a general increase in culture and refinement of living conditions resulted.

Architecture in England had gradually undergone many changes and in country mansions, as well as city palaces and public buildings, there was a combination of Gothic and feudal survivals combined with the architecture of the Renaissance and the rococo decorations of Italy and France.

Inigo Jones introduced the Italian style of architecture into England in the Seventeenth century. This is best shown in the Banqueting House in Whitehall, the only part of a great palace designed by him, which was never finished. It was of classic simplicity, a rectangle adorned with columns and rows of small paned windows, surmounted by alternate round and arched gables.

Jones was succeeded by Sir Christopher Wren, also a follower of the Italian school. He built the library of Pembroke College at Cambridge, the Sheldonian Theater at Oxford, and made the plans for the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral. His work is marked by a return to barrel vaulting and domes. There was in fact little new or distinctive in the architecture of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries, only an adaptation of the old forms.

With the increase in home life and home amusements, the interior of houses had come to be given greater consideration and there was not only an increase in the amount of furniture deemed necessary for even the humblest abodes, but also a great improvement in style.

Furniture, except of the rudest sort, had been found only in the homes of the very rich. It had been massive and uncomfortable, adapted to great palace halls. Now it was built on finer and more useful lines. The English furniture makers did not develop the exaggerated delicacy and elaborate ornamentation found in France during the time of the Louises. Although some of their designs were impractical, they were for the most part of such real use and beauty that they are still copied and regarded as expressive of the best taste in furniture.

The furniture of the Seventeenth century was heavy but not unattractive. The Eighteenth

century, however, is considered as the great period of English furniture designing.

Chippendale was the first of the great English cabinet makers. He employed the marvelous inlay work which, coming from the Orient, has been described as Chinese Chippendale. His furniture is marked by the slender curved legs and the paneled backs found on chairs. He employed little carving, which had been the previous method of furniture ornamentation and was still followed by many cabinet makers. He was followed by Sheraton, the designer of the straight, tapering lines which are popular even to-day; by Heppelwhite, whose work is often confused with that of Chippendale because of its similarity, and by the Adams brothers.

The Adams brothers were architects of the Italian school and they carried the simple classic lines of their architecture into the decorations and furnishings of the homes they designed. They employed the wreath and classic urn as decorative features, but their carving was never overdone. They also used panels of cane in their furniture and invented the wing chair, which has never ceased to be popular.

Tapestry weaving in connection with the furniture was naturally of great importance. Up to the Eighteenth century France had led in this industry. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes caused many of the Huguenots or French Protestants

to leave France and settle in England. Among them were many of the best French tapestry weavers, and factories for weaving silks and mixed materials in imitation of French designs sprang up in Cheshire, Norfolk, Yorkshire and other parts of England.

Thus education, culture and refinement spread from the Continent to the cities and the large country estates of England, being communicated from the manor houses to the cottages of the tenants, though in lesser degree, and England entered upon a period of history and life which may be correctly called modern.

Russia, Prussia, Spain, Italy

WE have learned how the Teutons and Celts rose from barbarism to a state approaching modern civilization, but nothing has yet been said of that vast tract of land and mass of individuals situated partly in Europe, partly in Asia, and known as Russia and the Russians. The reason for this omission is that, until the Seventeenth century, Russia lived apart from the other European countries, an unexplored land, an unknown people. Up to that time the civilization and commerce of Western Europe did not touch or influence Russia and she was neither a menace nor an aid to the progress of the west.

Geographically, Russia is an extension of the vast plain of Northern Asia; even European Russia exceeds in size all the other European states combined, but its importance in world history has not yet been commensurate with its size. Long before the Christian era this country had been settled by Slavic tribes, and as early as 862 these tribes had been consolidated into a State. Before the

end of the Tenth century the Greek Church had been introduced from Constantinople and from this source civilization would probably have come into Russia had it not been for the invasion of the Mongols or Tartars in the Twelfth and Thirteenth centuries.

These Tartar tribes conquered northern China and Central Asia and from there swept into Russia, which had by this time fallen apart into different principalities. These principalities were allowed to continue, but were made subject to the Tartar rulers and compelled to send annual tribute to their court.

The Tartar power declined in the Fourteenth century and the Russians freed themselves from their rule. Before this was accomplished, however, the imprint of the East was indelibly stamped on Russian life. Court customs were Asiatic, the early Russian armor was more like the Chinese than the European, and they wore turban headdresses, a form of which is still common in central Russia.

Ivan the Terrible, a powerful Russian prince, assumed the title of Czar in 1547. This title came from Asia and is not a form of Cæsar as has often been said. When Peter the Great came to the throne in 1682 he found himself in possession of a great kingdom, cut off from the rest of Europe and without a single outlet to the sea. He realized that Russia was far behind the other countries of

Europe in both civilization and military training and equipment.

To learn how to remedy these things he went on a tour through Germany, Holland and England. Here he saw and studied European methods and even worked with his own hands in the ship-yards of Holland. He gathered about him artisans, carpenters, scientists and men who understood armament and military training, and brought them back to Russia with him. He came home to face and quell a revolt of his own royal guards and some of his nobles who disapproved of his advanced ideas. He was a reformer with absolute power. He reorganized the army and his state administration upon European standards; he took the women out of their Oriental seclusion and encouraged them to mingle socially with men; he sent young men abroad to study and encouraged foreigners to come to Russia; he forced his people to shave their long beards and discard their flowing robes for the European dress of the time.

His next step was to secure his "window," a port from which Russia could carry on commerce with the rest of the world. He owned a small piece of land on the Baltic which he had conquered from Sweden. He filled in the marshes which dotted this land and built the city of St. Petersburg or in Russian Petrograd, Peter's City, which served as a port and as a new capital for his kingdom, for he

had never been able to modernize the old capital of Moscow to his satisfaction. It must not be thought, however, that the reforms of Peter the Great wrought any great change in the living conditions of the common people of Russia. Serfdom was being abolished in the rest of Europe at the time of his reign, but it had only been established about a century before in Russia and was now developing and spreading over the entire country. Serfdom was a logical development in Russia, where the value of land depended entirely on the ability of the owners to get workers for it. There was so much land that while the peasants had the privilege of going and coming as they pleased, the land owners were often without laborers to till their fields. This condition was recognized by the czar, who issued an edict prohibiting the peasants from leaving the land. Fines, forced labor and the almost despotic authority of the landowner over his peasants were easily developed after this, and while the central power of the czar had grown so great that feudal states did not develop, serfdom was the condition of a great mass of the common people even as late as the Nineteenth century.

The education which Peter encouraged was only for the favored few and did not in any sense take the peasantry into consideration. His ambitions were not for his people, his reforms and innovations being only aimed at strengthening the im-

portance of his country as a military and commercial power.

The great mass of the people were engaged in agriculture, though many of them, especially in Asiatic Russia, were semi-nomadic horsemen and cattle raisers. These cattlemen, who lived on the border close to the Mongol kingdom, were called Cossacks. They engaged in frequent battles with the Mongol tribes across the border and established a reputation for fierceness and bravery which they still hold. They formed a loosely organized cavalry trained to war and were allowed special privileges.

There were in Russia even fewer facilities for transportation and inland commerce than in the rest of the European countries. There were, of course, no railroads and the vast extent of the country made it a matter of difficulty for the people to exchange the products of cities and farms.

Great fairs were held at stated times in fixed places to facilitate this interchange. To these fairs the people from the surrounding country journeyed, bringing their produce with them. Sometimes the fairs lasted for several weeks and very often they possessed a religious significance, being held in conjunction with the celebration of some feast day of the Greek Christian Church. Permission to hold the more important of these fairs was granted by the czar; authority for the smaller ones came from the nobles on whose lands they were held.

At the fall of the Byzantine Empire the Czar of Russia, being ruler of the largest country adhering to the Eastern Church, became head of the Greek Church. He confined his power, however, to things secular and never interfered with the rules of the Church, which were made by its governing body, the Holy Synod.

The work of Peter the Great was carried on a generation later by the astonishing Catherine II, who came to the throne in 1762. From this time on Russia was more and more a power to be reckoned with in anything pertaining to the history of Europe.

ANOTHER power which rose about the same time was Prussia in northern Germany. The most important part of Prussia was originally only a strip of territory known as the Electorate of Brandenburg, extending less than one hundred miles east and one hundred miles west of the then small town of Berlin, which the German Emperor Sigismund had sold to the Hohenzollern family. Prussia was the name originally given to a strip of territory on the Baltic, conquered from heathen Slavs by the Teutonic Knights during the Crusades. When, in Luther's time, the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights abolished the order, he took the

title of Duke of Prussia. When his family died out his duchy was inherited by the Dukes of Brandenburg, thus uniting the two estates of Brandenburg and Prussia. In 1701 the Emperor of Germany permitted the holder of these two duchies to assume the title of king and he chose to be called King of Prussia.

Frederick II, 1712-1786, better known as Frederick the Great, became king in 1740, after a training the severity of which more than verged on senseless cruelty. He was tolerant in religion, liberal in rule and allowed some freedom of the press, but he went about developing his army into a smoothly working and powerful machine. He built canals and roads, reorganized the departments of the government and encouraged arts and sciences, but he looked upon the German language as barbaric and spoke and wrote only French and conducted his court on the French model, although he was most simple in personal tastes and habits.

Under him Prussia came to be looked upon as one of the Great Powers, dividing with Austria the influence over the lesser German states and principalities. His faith was in his army and his own administrative ability, and his works proved that his faith was well founded. Shrewd, forceful, direct but narrow, he established a material prosperity founded upon force and military power. We shall learn more of him later in this volume.

It was during the time of Frederick the Great and in Prussia that Germany's greatest philosopher lived and died. In Königsberg a man was born, lived, and died, who was apparently untouched by all the upheaval in the world about him, yet who is credited with being as great a force for change as was the French Revolution itself. Immanuel Kant, 1724-1804, lived a most uneventful life. He was educated at the University of Königsberg, became a tutor, teacher and lecturer, and was finally given the chair of philosophy at the same university. He was never further away from his home town than thirty miles.

In 1781 he wrote the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Before that time his lectures had been well attended and he steadily attracted large groups of students. He taught a moral rationalism independent of Church history and was finally opposed by the Lutherans. Being no controversialist he retired from teaching and devoted himself to writing.

Kant examined the ability of the human mind to reason on questions of infinity. He pointed out that we could know and reason upon our own mental experiences but that we could only guess at or speculate upon what things are in themselves, as they are outside our actual experience.

His effort was to establish the relationship of the individual to the universe and his conclusion was that the ideas of divinity and morality, and of

progress in nature and human development, could be arrived at by pure reason. All critical and analytical thought was given a great impetus by him and it was he and his philosophy which was responsible for the higher criticism for which the German universities were noted during the last half of the Nineteenth century.

WE have already learned how the two Christian kingdoms of Spain and Portugal were formed on the Spanish peninsula. During the Fifteenth and Sixteenth centuries these countries had risen to great prominence and power. From them came many of the explorers who dared the unknown western waters and founded colonies in the Indies and in America. The beginning of the Seventeenth century found both Spain and Portugal much poorer and less powerful, and before the Eighteenth century they were to lose much more. Spain had made the mistake of valuing her colonial possessions only for the wealth which they could yield. Her ships poured rich cargoes of gold, silver and spices into her ports and she was the marvel of the world for wealth, but her colonial policy was not constructive. She made little effort to develop the countries which were her source of wealth, or to establish in them governmental and military organizations which might have protected them from other nations.

The wealth which Spain and Portugal had both failed to protect was slipping into other hands, for the Netherlands, France and England, backed by armies and fleets of ships too powerful to be denied, were all going out for their share of the wealth beyond the seas.

Spain had been a part of the Holy Roman Empire, but constant intermarriage with the different royal houses of Europe often put the crown under dispute, as there was no fixed rule of succession.

In the beginning of the Eighteenth century Charles II of Spain died. He had neither children nor brothers to whom his realm would naturally have gone. The kingdom at this time comprised all of Spain except Portugal, a considerable part of Italy, including Sicily, Sardinia, the Duchy of Milan and some coast towns; the Spanish Netherlands; the Philippine Archipelago; the Caroline Islands; and due to the discoveries of Columbus, Cuba, Porto Rico and Trinidad; and in North America, Florida, Mexico and Texas; Central America, and all of South America except Brazil, which belonged to the Portuguese.

It is little wonder that all Europe was interested in who should control this wealth. Both Louis XIV of France and Leopold I of Austria were cousins of Charles II of Spain, and each of these rulers was married to a sister of Charles II. It was

certain that both of these monarchs would lay claim to the crown of Spain.

Charles II himself settled the dispute by leaving a will which made the Duke of Anjou, grandson of Louis XIV, his heir, with the understanding that the thrones of France and Spain should never be united. All Europe might have been satisfied had it not been that Louis XIV used his influence to place even greater restrictions on colonial trade than the Spanish kings had formerly placed on it. England, even then fighting for freedom of the seas, joined by Austria, Prussia and the Netherlands, proposed to take away some of the widespread lands of Spain, too rich a treasure to be controlled by France. To this end they made war, which lasted over a period of twelve years. There was even fighting between the French and English in the North American colonies, called Queen Anne's War.

The war was concluded at the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. The results of this treaty were that the Bourbon, Philip, was permitted to retain the crown of Spain, providing the conditions of the will were fulfilled and the crowns of France and Spain never rested on the same head. The Spanish possessions in Italy were ceded to the German Empire, as were also the Spanish Netherlands, which thus continued to form a barrier between the French and Dutch.

England gained the most. Her Protestant queen, Anne, was recognized by France as the legitimate ruler and she acquired the French possessions of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay region in the New World.

The wealth of a country is almost invariably reflected in its intellectual and artistic life and this was true of Spain during the days of her greatness.

Even greater writers and artists were to rise in the Seventeenth century. The greatest of her writers was Cervantes, a playwright, poet and novelist. Much of his work was of a satirical nature. His novel, *Don Quixote*, by which he is best known, was of this character. It was a burlesque on the era of chivalry, which though closed still lived in the popular romances of the time. It is no unusual reflection on the literary taste of the day that Cervantes' work, including *Don Quixote*, enjoyed little popularity during his lifetime. Many of the greatest writers of all time have been unappreciated until long after their demise.

Don Quixote has delighted thousands all over the world, young and old alike, for it can be read as a fairy tale or romance with no thought of the serious purpose behind it, which was to correct false literary standards and do away with outgrown ideals, or can be enjoyed as a keen satire on past conditions. Its popularity has increased as the years

go by. Cervantes is ranked with Swift in England and with Rabelais in France. His work, coming early in the Seventeenth century, may be considered as a last triumph of the Renaissance in Spain.

Don Quixote is the only piece of Spanish writing that has been universally recognized as world literature. Its popularity is due to the humane qualities attributed to its hero, his bravery, courtesy and kindness, and its realistic and typical minor characters. In spirit, it is probably the kindest book ever written. In this respect it resembles its noble-minded and generous-spirited author, who, after years of poverty and captivity, still observed life with an unfailing love and sweetness. Victor Hugo said of him, "In Cervantes was the deep, poetic spirit of the Renaissance."

The first notable painter in Spain was a Greek, Domenico Theotocopuli, called El Greco. His life is obscure; there are few facts known and fewer dates. We know that he was studying in Rome in 1570, so that his work belongs to the close of the Sixteenth century, and antedates that of Ribera.

His paintings have marked and peculiar characteristics, qualities which in their power and impressiveness make his art distinctive and at the same time show its relationship to all Spanish painting. All of his figures are long and gaunt, the heads small and narrow. There is an unusual pallor of the

flesh tints which, contrasted with the darkness of his backgrounds, emphasizes the severity of the facial expressions and makes even his religious subjects seem ultra-ascetic and unworldly.

The Seventeenth century, however, produced more painters than writers in Spain. The first of these, Giuseppe Ribera, 1588-1656, was born in the later part of the Sixteenth century, but his most notable work belongs to the Seventeenth. His parents desired to fit him for a literary career, but he neglected his studies and entered a school of painting. While still a boy he made his way to Italy, where he soon became known among the other artists as *Le Spagnoletto*, the little Spaniard. Here he studied under Caravaggio, who was at the head of the naturalist school of painting, which was also called the school of shadow painting, because of the strong contrasts of light and shade which these painters loved. The influence of Caravaggio and other masters is seen in Ribera's work, but it is essentially original and essentially Spanish, though he continued to live in Italy. He delighted in giving gloomy and startling impressions, and there is a certain grossness in his forms. This gloomy tone, partaking somewhat of cruelty in its realism, is characteristic of the work of almost every Spanish painter, so that while the great painters of Spain, like all great artists of every country, belong not alone to Spain but to the whole world, there is a

quality about their work which indelibly marks it as Spanish. It is perhaps an expression of that element in the Spanish people which added to the austerities of their religious faith, the horrors of the Inquisition.

In the last year of the Sixteenth century Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velasquez, 1599-1660, was born at Seville. He became one of the world's greatest masters of portraiture, though his work was little known outside of Spain until the Nineteenth century.

Velasquez was the head of the Spanish school of painting. He was familiar with the Italian art of the Renaissance but it seems to have influenced him very little. He was a portrait painter of great realism and even his religious pictures are full of life and individuality. He aspired to be perfect in little things and began by studying and painting still life. His greatest study, however, was the human face. He worked first with Spanish masters, but like all painters of the time, he eventually traveled and studied in Italy, returning to Spain to become immensely popular, and was made court artist.

His pictures of the royal family of Spain are among the greatest portraits in the world. Valued alike for their historic interest, their revelation of human character and their masterly ability, his paintings tell all there was to tell about

his subject and nothing about the painter himself.

We know that Velasquez was a great favorite with Philip, which accounts for the many portraits which he painted of the king and his family, but of his inner life and ambitions we know nothing. To-day he ranks among the greatest portrait painters.

While Velasquez was the favorite painter of the court, Bartholomé Estéban Murillo, 1618-1682, was the painter of the Church of Spain. He was born eighteen years after Velasquez. Velasquez was the son of a prosperous lawyer, but Murillo was the son of an humble artisan. His uncle, however, was an artist of ordinary talents and under him the boy Murillo first studied. He painted pictures which he sold to the American traders for small sums and at last secured money enough to travel. He went to Madrid, where Velasquez was already successful, and through the influence of the court painter he gained admittance to the galleries, thus securing an opportunity to study the great masters without going to Italy or Flanders, as he had at first intended.

Murillo was a wonderful painter of children. He depicted them with great tenderness and sympathy, sometimes with too much sentiment, and exercised his gifts and displayed this weakness in both secular and religious pictures. His Christ-child, and the round-faced cherubs so familiar in

his paintings, are beautiful and essentially human. His power to put atmosphere and feeling into his pictures and to surround his figures with gloomy color is much more marked than his ability to draw. The greater number of his pictures are still in the galleries of Spain, though some of them are in important galleries all over Europe and a few in the old churches of Mexico.

Murillo possesses less of the typical Spanish elements in his work than any of the great artists of Spain. He died in poverty, for the Church, for which he worked so faithfully, did not reward him as generously as the King of Spain did his contemporary, Velasquez.

Altogether Spanish, also, is the work of Francisco Lucientes y Goya, 1746-1828, who did not appear until the middle of the Eighteenth century when painting all over Europe was at low tide. He was a soldier, a duelist, a bull fighter, a musician, a painter of cartoons for the tapestry factory of Santa Barbara, and later court painter, and his versatile life is shown in his work. He was an etcher and sculptor as well as a genre and portrait painter. He was a realist to the point of vulgarity; vivid and powerfully dramatic in selection of subject and lavish in color. His influence on later French artists was great.

WHILE Western Europe was growing intellectually and artistically, Italy, which had been the birthplace of the new awakening in art, was fast falling into a decline. This may have been due to many reasons; the constant wars and unsettled political condition of the country no doubt had a great bearing on its decadence, but it seemed much more like the natural withering away of a flower which had come to full bloom.

When the great masters who had led the Renaissance died, there were left a host of imitators. Just as the Gothic architecture was developed to a point of impracticability, so the architecture of the Renaissance took on a weight of detail and ornamentation which destroyed its original beauty and the simplicity which had been its chief charm. The art which had been wholesome, natural and realistic became weak and affected, a mere imitation of former greatness. This was true in painting and sculpture as well as architecture.

Italy was torn by political and religious difficulties, and it is probable that the truly great minds which might have turned to art for expression were occupied with political disputes and military intrigues. The growing power of Austria was not conducive to the development of art. Patrons were more noted for financial than intellectual wealth, and there was little incentive for true

creative genius. The Austrian rule was one of military despotism and the people of Italy, oppressed and dissatisfied, lacked the spirit to develop, improve, or even to carry on the art that had been bequeathed to them by the great masters of the Renaissance.

The Netherlands

NO country in the world is so greatly influenced by its physical characteristics as The Netherlands. Its soil, much of which even at that time was reclaimed from the sea by drainage, was very rich. The land which is below the sea level was to some extent protected from inundation by the high sand dunes along the coast. These had been supplemented by dykes and the territory was and has since been constantly increased by drainage. There were many peat fields in The Netherlands, but as it was found that wherever the people dug for peat the water rushed in to fill up the cavities and became a menace to the surrounding country, a law was passed in the Sixteenth century making it necessary to drain the land before digging for peat. This caused the erection of innumerable windmills for pumping out the water, which are still a distinguishing feature of the scenery of The Netherlands.

In such a country as this, possessing rich agricultural land and a number of ports from which

commerce could be carried on with other countries, and inhabited by a peace loving, independent and industrious people, it was natural that wealth should increase rapidly and that a high degree of culture and civilization should follow. And there is no measuring the possibilities of this advancement were it not that throughout the history of Western Europe these heroic people have been compelled to either fight not only for their independence but for their very existence, or submit while their lands were trampled into battlefields by armies in whose victories they had but little interest.

There had been continuous strife until Holland had succeeded in wresting herself free from Spain on land, at the same time that England was destroying Spanish power on the sea. Now came an era of peace and prosperity in The Netherlands in which the people had opportunity to grow and develop, and in which they rose to the greatest height of their commercial and artistic supremacy.

When the art of the Renaissance was dying in Italy it was rising to new splendors in The Netherlands. The Dutch West and East Indian Trading Company had been established and the commerce of these rich islands was at this time largely controlled by the Dutch, though they were to suffer later from the rivalry of the English. In

the cities of Leyden and Amsterdam were rich merchants who were eager patrons of the arts and sciences.

Architects, writers, painters, scientists and philosophers flourished in the great cities of Flanders and Holland. Not only commercially but intellectually The Netherlands led the world. Added to the inspiration of Italy, France and Spain, the Dutch possessed a practical and methodical tendency which gave a substantial and lasting quality to all of their work.

They collected and classified the work of previous scholars, applied critical tests and added the new discoveries and developments of their own time. In a country which was the storm center of the religious difference of the time, the work of artists and writers was not cramped or narrowed by uniformity of religious beliefs, and while religious subjects were painted there was a tendency to draw from life, to depict the rural scenes which were before their eyes, the subjects of everyday life, and to paint portraits of individual men and women, an art which up to this time had been practically undeveloped, but which was now becoming popular in all the countries of Europe.

The art of Italy had belonged to public buildings or to large palaces. Much light and great wall spaces had encouraged decorative wall frescoes and big canvases.

In the Lowlands the artists did much work for individuals. Paintings, especially portraits, were used in home decoration not only by the nobility, but by the rich merchant class. This gave occasion for small canvases for use in the small rooms of private homes. While the walls of guildhalls and assembly rooms were hung with paintings of groups, each individual of the group being a portrait, the walls of homes required smaller, more intimate pictures.

The Dutch were an industrious, practical people and the basic element of their art is the quality of solidity. It is most real. Their little pictures are even more emphatically everyday and commonplace than are their portraits. The painting of streets and shops, the village scenes and interiors are photographic in their attention to detail.

Among the famous portrait painters of the Low Countries the names of Rubens, Van Dyck, Hals and Rembrandt are familiar all over the world.

Each of these great painters possessed individual characteristics, but the work of all of them is as essentially Dutch in its atmosphere as the work of the Spanish painters is Spanish. There is a homeliness, a friendly intimacy, about their canvases which makes them easily recognized everywhere even when unsigned.

Peter Paul Rubens, 1577-1640, is the leader of the Dutch school of painting. He inherited a

taste for learning from his father, but early evinced a desire to be a painter and was apprenticed to the master of one of the painters' guilds at Antwerp. Later as a painter he taught for a time at Antwerp. Then, according to the custom of the time of becoming attached to the household of some noble, he became one of the retinue of the Duke of Mantua, in his service visiting Madrid and Rome, where he made a long stay and gained much from a study of the great masters of the Italian Renaissance. When he returned to Antwerp, success at once came to him and his popularity rapidly increased. Marie de Medecis was building the palace of the Luxembourg at Paris at the time, and she persuaded Rubens to journey there and undertake the two series of great pictures illustrating scenes from her life and from that of her husband, Henry IV. These paintings now fill an entire hall in the Louvre.

He met the Duke of Buckingham in Paris in 1625, painted his portrait and made such an impression upon him that he went to England and was instrumental, where others had failed, in arranging peace between England and Spain. At a later date he remarked, "The painter occasionally amuses himself at diplomacy."

He was a man of great personal charm, great vitality and great industry. He painted portraits of the royal families of France, Spain and

England. He painted sacred pictures, scenes from the Bible and legends of the saints, mythology, history, allegory and landscape. He was most popular and was much sought after. He entertained visitors while painting and employed a reader to read the Latin classics to him while he worked, and never left his painting except when employed on affairs of state.

Some conception of his industry may be gained from his authenticated output, which numbers some fifteen hundred canvases, an almost unbelievable number even when we consider that he availed himself of the aid of many students and assistants.

His work is spectacular and eloquent, at times almost grandiloquent. It is vigorous in action to the point of exaggeration, yet rhythmical and strong in anatomy. He delighted in marked contrasts of light and color, in full-blooded, heroic figures, and all his canvases give a sense of generosity and splendor.

Van Dyck was a pupil of Rubens and his earlier religious pictures, painted in Antwerp, give no promise of his later mastery of portraiture. His best work was done in England, and as his greatest influence was there we have already given him his place.

Franz Hals, 1584-1666, was another of the great painters which this rich period produced. He

was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth and the arts and graces of a courtier were never acquired, but he had a rarer, greater gift. His sympathies and understanding were with everyone. Living at a time when the United Netherlands fought for and won their independence from Spain, he became a military guildsman, fighting for his country. He left many pictures of soldiers and guild brothers as well as of peasants and strolling musicians and players. These paintings, or many of them, he seems to have painted for his own pleasure. He also made portraits of notables, but these are not so well done. All are painted under ordinary conditions of light and color.

His guild pictures are especially interesting, for they contain many figures, each a reliable portrait, not only in facial likeness but also as to costume. His pictures are notable for their realism and mastery of method and so dexterous did he become that he is said to have finished canvases at a single sitting. One thing stands out again and again in his work. He was above everything else the painter of laughter. His associates may have, some of them, been a bit vague in their moral standards, but they were by no means borne down by the problems and hardships of everyday life.

Art is to most people a very serious matter and the fact that Hals painted so many laughing toppers was enough to condemn him to serious art

lovers and so a tradition has grown up about the name of Hals. He so obviously loved to paint those who loved wine and laughter that sober critics have declared him intemperate and dissolute. He was extravagant and careless in worldly affairs. Few artists have not been, but he lived to old age, he painted numberless wonderful pictures and his insight and mastery steadily progressed from youth to age. No drunkard could have lived his life or accomplished his work.

The greatest portrait painter and one of the greatest painters of all time was Hermens van Rinj Rembrandt, 1609-1669. Speculation about the greatness of these men leads nowhere. Why did those particular times produce two artists such as Hals and Rembrandt, so great and so unlike? We can only partially answer by saying that science, literature, poetry and drama were then at full tide and everywhere encouraged in The Netherlands.

Little is known of the life of Rembrandt. His biographies disagree in all but two points. All laud his work and all, in an effort to piece out a biography, tell more of his times and surroundings than they do of him. He did not attract great attention in his native land, and never left it. There must have been intervals when he lacked sitters, for he left eighteen portraits of his wife, Saska, and many of himself and his son Titus. We know that he was impractical and suffered severe

financial reverses and there is a church record devoting a few lines to his death, the only contemporary record that we have. That is about all.

We must learn of him from his paintings. We are at once impressed by the man's marvelous vitality. He is credited with over six hundred paintings and three hundred engravings and his interest went everywhere. There were religious subjects, scenes from everyday life, portraits of all sorts of people and of himself repeated again and again, and had he never painted, his name would have lived as that of the greatest etcher. He had a mastery of color and a treatment of light and shade that was before unknown and which has never been surpassed. By suppressing other details, he led the eye to the head, and over the face he threw a light which makes the center of his picture glow like a great jewel, as though it were lit up from within with a golden light. Courageous critics have dared to point out that this method of lighting is unnatural and it cannot be denied, yet we turn back again and again to one of his masterpieces completely satisfied with its mystic lights and shadows.

These painters are only a few of the many who brought fame to The Netherlands. Nor was the supremacy of art the only claim of this country to distinction. The University of Leyden had been founded in 1575; that of Groningen in 1585; and

Utrecht in 1634. These universities are still in existence, while the present Municipal University of Amsterdam is a continuation of the ancient Athenæum of that city. Louwenhoek, a Dutch linen merchant of the Seventeenth century, developed the microscope to such an extent that he could see blood corpuscles, and discovered the minute animal life of water, thus giving new impetus to the study of medicine and science.

Baruch Spinoza, a Jew whose family had taken refuge in The Netherlands from Spanish persecution, wrote many books, and treatises on natural philosophy. He was a pantheist, believing in an infinite natural source from which the entire universe sprang. He was an ardent advocate of freedom of speech and thought and many of his writings were not published until after his death. His work influenced the greatest minds of all Europe and in the Nineteenth century, two hundred years after his death, a statue was erected in his honor at The Hague.

It is significant that the great art of The Netherlands was produced at a time when the people as a whole were enjoying prosperity and were entering upon a period of peace for which they had fought for years. This long struggle for independence had developed that steadfastness of purpose and national spirit without which very little art of a lasting nature can be produced.

The Great Individualist

LOUIS XIV came to the throne of France under unusually fortunate circumstances. Cardinal Richelieu, who had been his father's prime minister and who continued to administer the government during the boyhood of the prince, was a man of strength of character and one of the great statesmen and diplomats of history.

He had centralized the power of France in the person of the monarch by reducing the last of the feudal nobles to a position in which they were content to be courtiers rather than rivals of the king. By his activities during the Thirty Years' War he had not only extended the boundaries of France but had won for his country a place as the first military power of Europe, a position formerly held by Spain.

Richelieu's successor, Cardinal Mazarin, had continued this policy of centralization. He drove the Huguenots, as the followers of Calvin were called in France, from the fortified towns which they occupied, so that they could no longer

defy the king, and their numbers were greatly depleted by emigration, so that they were no longer to be feared as a disturbing element.

When at last Louis XIV reached the age at which he took active control of affairs, he found France and the French throne more firmly placed than they had ever been since the days of Charlemagne.

Louis XIV was admirably fitted both by temperament and ability to carry on the work of these great statesmen, and to maintain the power which they had bequeathed to him. He was a man of fine appearance and courtly bearing and it was much more possible for him to assume and hold a place as absolute monarch than it had been for James I of England, who was a lout in appearance and possessed none of the courtly graces which he tried to practice and which he demanded in others.

The king was a great egotist. He considered himself not only the personification of France but the mouthpiece of God, and his assurance, strength of will and keen judgment enabled him to maintain this pose not only in France but throughout all Europe. He was a man of superior mentality and fine education for the time, and was active in his encouragement of art and literature. Anyone of talent could be sure of his generous patronage, but unfortunately his favorites were not

all chosen from among the great or learned, for anyone who could amuse the king or add wit or brilliance to his court, might find a place there, no matter how unscrupulous, dishonest or vicious his character.

When Mazarin died the people had expected Louis to choose a successor for the position of prime minister, but this the king declined to do. He gathered about him clever statesmen and diplomats, but insisted on maintaining the dominant position in the court. At first he allowed himself to be influenced by his advisers, but as the years went by he became more and more intolerant of others and less willing to depend on anyone but himself. "The profession of king is great, noble and delightful if one feels equal to performing the duties which it involves," he said. He had no doubt as to his own ability along these lines and he never allowed his love of pleasure to tempt him away from the personal execution of these duties and privileges.

There was no financial check on the French monarch as there had been on James I of England. His power was absolute. The French Parliament, called the Estates General, which was supposed to have some power in the levying of taxes, was only called by order of the king, and when Louis XIV assumed active government it had not been called for half a century. Louis

XIV levied taxes when and where he desired, and established himself in the most luxurious court that Europe had ever seen.

He erected at Versailles, just outside Paris, a great palace with magnificent gardens and fountains stretching about it. Around this palace a town was built with residences for the courtiers and a number of smaller palaces in which the king lived when he grew tired of the more formal residence.

The building of the palace was done under the direction of Jules Hardouin Mansard, the nephew of Francois Mansard, the architect who invented the roof named after him. Jules Mansard also built the palace of the Grand Trianon, the dome of the Hotel des Invalides, the Place de Vendome and the Place des Victories. The work of the elder Mansard lives only in old prints but the inspiration of Jules Mansard is still strong in French architecture.

The palaces of Versailles, both externally and internally, were magnificent beyond anything previously known and cost the nation about one hundred million dollars, despite the fact that thousands of peasants and soldiers were forced to work on the construction of this royal city, without remuneration.

Here was not only grandeur but luxury and comparative comfort. The French weavers

were expert in the making of tapestries and the furniture of Louis XIV was upholstered in tapestries, silks and velvets. Luxury and beauty were always present but dignity was not sacrificed, and all was in keeping with the rooms which the furniture adorned.

The French nobles, who had previously lived on their own estates planning for independent power, now flocked to the court at Versailles and devoted their energies to currying favor with the Grand Monarch, as he was called. They became mere retainers of the king, dependent on him for wealth and advancement, for he was generous with his favorites and the man who could amuse or entertain was as sure of favor as the one who instituted governmental reform.

Louis XIV delighted in pomp and ceremony and he fully realized its value. His courtiers were lined up to receive him when he rose in the morning and they attended him to his bed at night. It was esteemed a great honor to be the one who should hand him a garment when he was dressing, or render him some trifling service at table.

During the early years of his reign, the influence of his minister, Colbert, brought about a number of admirable reforms for France. Colbert discovered that many of the courtiers were stealing and wasting vast sums of money and he

arrested the offenders and wherever possible forced them to reimburse the treasury. He then instituted a system of bookkeeping similar to that in use by business houses, so that Louis XIV had the finances of the country so well under contral that whatever was wasted he could waste in person.

With an eye to the prosperity of the country on which his revenue was dependent, Louis now turned to the manufacturing interests of France. He passed laws regulating the width of cloths and the kind of dye to be used. To assist in maintaining these laws he reorganized the ancient guilds, which had fallen into decay. In this way French goods were brought up to so high a standard that they could command the world's best prices, and gold and silver flowed into France from foreign countries and thence to the royal treasury in the form of taxes.

Thus a strong and prosperous nation was built up to support the court which became the acknowledged center of the world, fulfilling the ambitions of its monarch. French literature, French dress and French manners became the model for all Europe and the French language the language of polite society everywhere, and the courts of other countries strove in all things to imitate that of France as the model of perfection.

The French court became a magnet to which was drawn the wealth, wit and talent of all

Europe. Louis XIV called himself *Le Roi Soleil*, the Sun King, and toward this sun was turned the face of every man in Europe who desired artistic, literary, financial or political advancement. Even the moral standards of the French court, which were not high, especially during the early years of Louis' reign, were imitated as much as possible by other courts throughout Europe.

In his encouragement of arts and letters Louis XIV more than balanced the immoral influence of his court on the manners of his time. About him was gathered a society of writers, artists, preachers and actors in whose work men still find some of the most profound philosophy and brightest wit that the world has ever known.

The foundation for this society had been laid before Louis ascended the throne. The French Academy had been founded in the time of Richelieu but was encouraged and developed by Louis XIV. Its members have since been called the Immortals, because the standards of eligibility were so high that anyone who was admitted was sure of immortal fame. Louis XIV limited the membership to forty. The French Academy is still in existence, though not in its original form, and still extends a strong influence over French intellectual life.

Before the time of Louis XIV Blaise Pascal, 1623-1662, the philosopher, scientist and

mathematician, had already given form to French prose. Pascal discovered many of the laws relating to the pressure of air and equilibrium of liquids. The Gothic tower of St. Jacques, where he made his experiments in Paris, still stands. He also demonstrated the theory on which was based the game of roulette. He was followed by a long list of philosophers, poets and playwrights who wrote in the French tongue.

The Academy gave special attention to the promotion of the use of the French language in literature and did much to purify it and rid it of slang and idiom, which was as common in that day as in our own. The literature produced under its influence contains some of the most vital and expressive as well as some of the most interesting documents in existence.

The Journal des Savants was founded for the promotion of science, and Colbert, Louis' great minister of finance, had an astronomical observatory built at Paris. The Royal Library, which possessed only sixteen thousand volumes, was greatly increased. This library, now known as the National Library of France, housed in a great building in Paris containing hundreds of thousands of volumes, is the largest library in the world and still attracts thousands of scholars.

Louis XIV believed that the promotion of art, literature and science was one of the first

duties of the government. To his court came Fénelon and Bossuet, two of the greatest clerics of the time. Fénelon came as preceptor to the young Duke of Burgundy; and Bossuet, the great preacher, was preceptor to the young Dauphin. Both were great orators and the writings of the two are still being read. The influence of Bossuet was very great. He came to court as Bishop of Condom and was later made Bishop of Meaux and during his long life did much to determine the policy of the court toward Huguenot subjects.

The court listened to the sermons of these religious orators but took equal interest and doubtless greater pleasure in attending the performances of the Royal Theatre, where Molière and his Troupe du Roi were playing.

Molière was one of the king's favorites. This great dramatist, like so many of the great playwrights, was also an actor and usually presented his own plays. His uncle had been upholsterer to Louis XIII, a position which included some of the duties of a valet de chambre, for the upholsterer followed the king wherever he went and arranged the furnishings of his apartments. Molière inherited this honor but soon resigned it. For years he was a strolling player, traveling from town to town through France, poor and homeless, little better than a vagabond and presenting his plays in inn yards, in tennis courts on the estates

of nobles who chose to patronize him, or wherever he could secure an audience. Sometimes a noble patron would give him his cast-off clothing and this was used for the costuming of the troupe. At last, through friends made during his brief connection with the court as upholsterer, his work was brought to the attention of Louis XIV, who found amusement in it and he and his company of players were established at Versailles where they presented his plays every other day before the king and court, even continuing after the famous Madame Maintenon, the last of the feminine favorites of the king, had imposed her moralizing influence there.

Critics agree that Molière was not only the brightest name in French literature but the greatest comic dramatist of all time. His plays live and are still produced because, combined with his intimate understanding of human foibles, he possessed practical working knowledge of stage necessities and dramatic values. His lifelong experience as an actor taught him how to write plays that the scholar would enjoy reading and that the crowd would enjoy seeing acted.

He presented not only his own successful comedies and unsuccessful tragedies but also the works of Peter Corneille, the famous dramatist and poet who had preceded him. Peter Corneille and his brother Thomas were of those who had laid the foundations of the French supremacy in literature.

Contemporary with Molière was Jean Racine, rival of Corneille, writer of perfect French, a dramatic poet who had won a pension from Louis XIV by means of various odes addressed to that monarch; Nicholas Boileau, the critic, and LaFontaine, the famous fablist. These men formed a friendship and association which they called the Society of Four.

One of the remarkable things about the literature of this period in France is the manner in which all the writers were drawn together in a close circle around the person of the king. They were not all friends, but they were all satellites around the same sun and Louis XIV made their genius reflect his glory. Molière and Boileau were made joint historiographers of Louis XIV and followed him in his various military campaigns. In this they may be considered as among the first modern writers to have adopted the profession of war correspondents.

To LaBruyère, one of the numerous tutors at court, we owe some of the most vivid word pictures of the personnel of Louis' administration. LaBruyère was a student who did not himself mingle with the life of the court, but sat outside the circle and with keen observation wrote his impressions. He was one of the first writers to consider the condition of the working classes, and he drew a vivid picture of them as patient beasts of burden,

which was in itself a prophesy of the revolution to come. Talent was not long ignored in the court of Le Roi Soleil and LaBruyère was discovered and made a member of the Academy in 1693. The memories of Cardinal Retz, as the observations of a diplomat who was close to the king, provide another source of interesting information about the court.

Literary men were largely dependent upon patrons for a living and in this way much of their writing was influenced by a desire to please the king or the particular noble who had pensioned them. This did not prevent Molière and many others from frankly satirizing the life of the court and even the person of the king himself. Either the vanity of Louis XIV blinded him to these things or else he was willing to forgive the gibes because of the literary merit or the interest of the productions.

Beautiful and talented women had even more influence with Louis XIV than did talented men, and there was a long train of feminine favorites. Some of these women held their place by force of beauty alone, but there were many of them whose work still lives, who maintained an enviable position because of their mental attainments. Women of the nobility were often as well educated as men. It was the fashion of the time for them to study Greek and Latin, just as a cen-

tury later all women of refinement in England learned French, music and drawing.

Among these women were Madame LaFayette, the friend of de LaRochefoucauld, whose Maxims still delight. Madam LaFayette wrote *La Princesse de Clèves*. There was Madame de Motteville who wrote her *Memoirs*; Mlle. de Montpensier, whom Sévigné called My great Mademoiselle, and Madame de Sévigné herself, the most charming of them all. Madame de Sévigné's letters are among the most precious literary legacies of the time. In addition to being models of prose style they give us an accurate view of court life, manners and ideals.

Madame de Sévigné, in her position as a widow with ample means, was enabled to move about as she pleased and observe the life of the court. She was unusually successful in keeping her name free from scandal, no little task in those times. Her letters were not written for publication, but were addressed to various friends and relatives and their sprightliness and intimacy form a fascinating and illuminating chapter in the literature of the time of Louis XIV. The Hotel Carnavalet, which she occupied for some time during the latter part of her life, is still in existence, now a government museum devoted to the Revolution.

These women were the founders of the French Salon idea. In their homes they gathered

together the wit and beauty of the French capital, forming little courts of their own in which they reigned by right of personality and charm.

The women of intellectual attainments were not the only ones whose influence was felt in Versailles and Paris. They shared honors with women whose only source of power was in their beauty. Chief among these were the favorites of the king. His wife was not congenial to Louis XIV and she had many rivals. Mademoiselle de la Vallière was the first of these. She was displaced by Madame de Montespan, and she gave place to Madame de Maintenon, the widow of the poet and playwright Scarron. Louis XIV was secretly married to Madame de Maintenon, who became the unacknowledged queen for the last thirty years of his reign and exercised a powerful influence over the life of the court. She was of a deeply religious temperament and used her power to check as far as possible the immoral tendencies of the time. Women have probably never exercised a greater influence on any court than they did on that of Louis XIV, not only directly but through the men with whom they associated on a plane of intellectual and social equality.

The artists were not idle. Perrault and Mansard, the two great architects of the time, had combined their talents, creating the additions to the Louvre, which still attracts thousands of visitors

annually, not only because of the art treasures which it contains, but also to see the building itself.

The foundations for French supremacy in art as in literature had been laid before Louis XIV ascended the throne. The names of Nicholas Poussin, 1594-1665, and Claude Lorrain, 1600-1682, are identified with this foundation. Their art was a direct inheritance from the Low Countries, though in its expression it was entirely original.

Poussin studied under a Flemish painter at Paris. He made, too, a careful study of a collection of engravings from the Italian masters, which was in the possession of Courtois, the mathematician. He became "first painter in ordinary" to Louis XIII, and during his residence in Paris was given commissions by many men of prominence. Many of his pictures were of a religious nature, but the changing and broadening ideas in matters of art are shown in the Triumphs of Flora, painted for Cardinal Omodei; a Bacchanal, painted for Cardinal Richelieu; the series of Labors of Hercules, for the Louvre, and other pictures, classic and fanciful in conception.

The man who may be regarded as the first great landscape artist was Claude de Lorrain, whose real name was Claude Gelée. He adopted the name of his birthplace and it was as Claude Lorrain that he was known during his lifetime. In his paintings Claude Lorrain marked a new

epoch in art. Religious paintings had given way to portraiture in the Dutch school, but Claude Lorrain expressed the beauty of nature apart from incident or personality. He was not a realist. He painted direct from nature, traveling all over Europe to find inspiration in the scenery of different lands, but he idealized his scenes. He was supreme in his ability to suggest distance and to express light and shade. He was interested in architecture and made a careful study of anatomy, but where buildings or figures are used in his work, they are put in merely as details. His genius was devoted to nature as a thing apart from humanity or human work.

Claude Lorrain published a book of his own drawings, copied from his paintings, called the *Liber Veritatis*, to enable people to distinguish his paintings from those of his many imitators. Illustrative of the fact that France had not yet become an art center, the greatest number of Lorrain's paintings are not to be found in France, but in England. He received many commissions and his pictures brought high prices even in his lifetime. His influence in later days on Turner, the great English landscapist, was so great that when Turner left his paintings to the English government he made the provision that two of them should be hung permanently between two of Claude Lorrain's. He also undertook a large series of engrav-

ings which he called *Liber Studiorum*, in imitation of the title of Lorrain's engravings.

Following Lorrain were the great portrait painters, Rigaud, Mignard and LeBrun; and the decorative artist Watteau, who marked another and no less important epoch in the development of painting.

Pierre Mignard was born at Troyes. At the age of twenty he went to Italy and having made a reputation for himself in that country, he returned to France, in answer to a summons from the king, who did not want any talent to escape from his court. He painted a successful portrait of Louis XIV, and was soon in high favor, but a rivalry existed between Mignard and LeBrun, who was at that time head of the French Academy, and Mignard refused to become a member of this body. Thus he was shut out from participation in these public works which were the particular province of the Academy, and he devoted himself almost exclusively to portraiture. Most of the beauties and celebrities of the day sat to him, Molière, Bossuet, LaVallière, Montespan, Maintenon, Sévingé, and many others. When LeBrun died Mignard deserted the artist faction opposed to the Academy and succeeded to all the honors held by LeBrun.

LeBrun was born at Paris in 1619. When only fifteen years old he received commissions from Cardinal Richelieu and his work attracted the atten-

tion of Poussin, who was still living. Poussin took LeBrun with him to Rome. On his return to France the young painter ingratiated himself with Mazarin and through Mazarin became associated with Colbert in his work for the industrial development of France. Together they founded the Academy of Painting and Sculpture, and a few years later the Academy of France at Rome.

In 1660 they founded the Gobelins as a state factory and school where not only tapestries but all sorts of furniture required in royal dwellings was designed and made under the direct supervision of LeBrun. The Gobelins was originally a dyeing establishment started by Jehan Gobelin in the Faubourg Saint Marcel, Paris. He discovered a red dye which was used in the tapestries which the Gobelin family began to manufacture in connection with their dyeing establishment in the Sixteenth century.

Through the Gobelin school, LeBrun controlled the industrial art of France, and through the Academy he was the head of all the independent artists of the country. In this position of power he placed his imprint not only on the art of France during his lifetime, but left a lasting impression on the work of his followers. There was a pompous grandeur to the work of LeBrun which found great favor with Louis XIV and led to the conferring of knighthood and a large pension on the artist. Aside

from LeBrun's works in the Louvre and the palace at Versailles, he executed many religious pictures and was expert in modeling and engraving.

The importance of engravers, of whom there were many at this time, cannot be overestimated. They made numerous copies of the works of the painters, thus giving them a wide circulation among people who could not have afforded to buy the originals. Many did much to build up the reputations of the painters whose works they copied, as well as contributing a very valuable treasure of their own to the art of the world.

Another of the portraitists was Hyacinthe Rigaud. Rigaud excelled at portrait painting but desired to be known as a historical painter and sought admittance to the academy on that basis. This delayed his admittance, which would have been granted at once on his portraits. When he did enter he became one of the leading spirits of that organization.

All these painters were, except in their portraits, endeavoring to carry on the classic ideals of the Renaissance. Lorrain, the landscape painter, and one other were the only exceptions. That other was Antoine Watteau. He produced an art that was typically French, vital and of the time. He was born at Valenciennes in 1684, of Flemish origin, but he was more French in his work than any of the Frenchmen who preceded or were contemporary

with him. He early went to Paris and worked first for a scene painter. It was perhaps here that he acquired the artificiality of feeling with which all his work is saturated, and which he developed to an artistic daintiness and beauty which express so perfectly the art ideals of the court of Louis XIV.

He first worked in a factory where religious pictures were turned out by thousands and where he almost starved on his pay of three francs a week. Then he entered the studio of Claude Audran, who was then keeper of the art treasures of the Luxembourg Palace. Here he had ample opportunity to study the works of the older masters, but while they influenced his technique, his subjects and treatment were original in every way. His work attracted the attention of Rigaud, through whose influence he was made an associate and finally a full member of the Academy.

His pictures have a charming lightness of manner. He devoted himself to imaginative and decorative subjects. His shepherds and shepherdesses are not the keepers of real sheep but creatures of the imagination whose unreality is more than compensated for by their charm and daintiness. Their flowered frocks and ribbon-decorated crooks are recognized as of Watteau all over the world. His wreath and cupid motives are identified with the period of Louis XIV and XV, whether it is found on canvas, as a mural decoration, or as an adornment to furniture.

With all its lightness and delicacy his work has a sensuous quality which was later to be exaggerated into coarseness in the work of his successors who painted for the court of Louis XV. Dancing was a favorite diversion of the time and is shown in many of the Watteau paintings; the pastoral dancing of the dainty beribboned shepherds and shepherdesses, and another dance, the minuet, highly characteristic of the formal court of Louis XIV. Louis, like so many men of great energy, was small, and to increase his height he wore high heeled shoes and great wigs. These were copied by his courtiers just as the women of the court copied the exaggerated costumes of the queen. High heeled shoes, immense powdered wigs and crinolines did not lend themselves to any but the most decorous and stately of dances, hence the minuet.

One might think that all the wealth of art and literature with which the Grand Monarch had surrounded himself, combined with the encouragement of commercial activities, was building for the future greatness of France. But Louis XIV was not thinking of the future. He gloried in the greatness of France because he considered it an expression of his own greatness. He said "I am the State," and what he did for France he did for himself.

He was not content with internal development. He wanted military glory as well, and maintained a large and carefully organized army and had

skillful generals at the heads of the various departments. With this army he prosecuted continuous wars against his neighbors, many of which had no excuse except his own desire for aggrandizement and glory. In these wars he squandered the money which Colbert had collected in the royal treasury and to meet this deficit the people were burdened with still heavier taxes.

Meanwhile Louis XIV was pursuing a policy no less unstatesmanlike and disastrous with his Protestant subjects. The Huguenots had been removed from their position of power in fortified towns but had been given a certain amount of religious freedom under the Edict of Nantes. They had taken up manufacture, trade and banking, and formed the most industrious and prosperous class in France. The phrase "as rich as a Huguenot" had become a proverb.

A new series of persecutions began under Louis XIV. The Huguenot churches were demolished, and other means used to persuade them to accept the religion of the court. At last Louis was convinced that the greater number of the Huguenots had been converted and with this belief in mind he revoked the Edict of Nantes, thus making the Huguenots outlaws and their ministers subject to the death penalty. The result of this was that thousands of Huguenots fled from the country, taking their wealth, industry and manufacturing

skill to other lands, and strengthening Louis' rivals even as they weakened France. One thing was gained for the world through the unnecessary wars of the Grand Monarch. This was the remarkable development of international law. The incessant wars and numerous treaties emphasized the need of well defined laws regulating the relations of one nation to another in times of both war and peace.

Such matters as the rights of ambassadors, the treatment of neutral possessions, treatment of prisoners and other details, which had previous to this time been left entirely to the discretion of each monarch individually, were now governed by international law which was binding on all countries. During the Thirty Years' War, Grotius, a Dutch writer, had published a book called *War and Peace* dealing with this subject, and this was followed in the time of Louis XIV by Pufendorf's *On the Law of Nature and Nations*, published in 1672. These were the beginning of the rules which have since prevented many wars, and pointed out ways of settling international disputes by means of discussion through ambassadors, without recourse to arms.

The unwise internal policy of the French king, combined with his wars and the heavy taxes and enormous debts which they involved, had reduced France to a perilous financial condition. The court continued to persist in grandeur and luxury, intolerant of the needs of the people and

careless of the future of the nation, but Louis was no longer in ignorance of the direction in which the ship of state was drifting. It is at this time that he is reputed to have said "After me the deluge." He reigned seventy-two years and outlived both his son and his grandson, and at his death he left a weakened and demoralized kingdom to his great grandson, Louis XV, who was then only five years old.

The Legacy

LOUIS XIV had foreseen trouble for his young heir and sought to control the administration after his death by a will in which he appointed a Council of Regency. The Duke of Orleans was to be president of the regency, but this arrangement was set aside and the Duke of Orleans was made sole regent with full power to govern until the king should reach his legal majority, which was attained at the youthful age of thirteen.

The young king grew to manhood, developing vicious and immoral personal tendencies far greater than those of his predecessors. He had seven children and for a while seemed very fond of his wife, but she was soon displaced by a succession of female favorites. These women not only influenced the king's personal life but because of his weak will and general ineptitude for government, were allowed to interfere in affairs of state as well.

By far the most remarkable and powerful woman of the court was Madame de Pompadour, Jeanne Antoinette Poisson le Normant d'Etioles.

Endowed with wit, wealth and beauty, she had actually been reared with the idea that she would one day be a king's favorite, a position which at that time was rather envied than deplored. A fortune teller had foretold that she would hold a position of power in France, and even after she was married to Le Normant d'Etioles and entered the financial circle of Paris, she was still obsessed with the desire to enter the life of the court.

Eventually Madame d'Etioles found her opportunity and was soon established at Versailles. Louis XV bought the estate of Pompadour for her and from this she took the name by which she was afterward called. She began to exercise her power at once and soon completely controlled French politics, both internal and international. She corresponded with the generals of the French army, she arranged for the king's ministers to meet her in her own apartments in the palace and all the business of the court passed through her hands before it came before the king. In short, she made herself so indispensable to him that even after he had grown tired of her, and other women had taken her place in his affections, she still continued in power at court, in the guise of lady in waiting to his wife, whose friendship she had gained.

The Pompadour realized the tremendous influence exerted by writers and artists and she extended generous patronage to them. The French

people worshiped these men and she courted them continuously. Voltaire was her poet. The artists and engravers, VanLoo, Boucher, Vien, Greuze and Jacques Quay, were a part of her train of courtiers. She herself was an etcher and engraver of no mean ability.

The military glory of France was dying but she still maintained her supremacy in the realm of literature. The very influences that were breaking up the power of the French monarchy produced thinkers and writers of unusual note.

The growing financial troubles of the country brought out a school of economists. Francois Quesnay, who was physician to Pompadour and physician in ordinary to Louis XV, was prominent among these. Quesnay devoted himself to economic studies, taking no part in the intrigues of the court. In company Jean C. M. V. de Gournay he formed the philosophic sect called first the Economists and later the Physiocrats. Mirabeau, the elder; Nicholas Baudeau, G. F. L. Le Trosne, Mercier Larivière and Dupont de Nemours were all members of this body and all wrote books and articles on the subject of economics. Turgot, who was even greater as a financier than Colbert, was a pupil of Quesnay.

Turgot was educated for the Church but gave it up to enter political life. In Paris he frequented salons of the brilliant women of the time

and became interested in economics. In 1761 he had opportunity to give his undivided attention to this subject, for he was appointed intendant of the généralité of Limoges, which included some of the poorest and most overtaxed parts of France. Here, as in other parts of the country, there were many remains of the feudal system, unjust taxation and corvées. Turgot secured a resurvey of the land and a reduction of the contribution of the entire province of Limoges. He also abolished the corvée there, substituting a money tax and having the roads built by contractors instead of by means of the corvée of forced labor previously imposed on the peasants.

Turgot wrote many books dealing with conditions, not only in his own province, but with the varying and unjust conditions all over France. It was not until Louis XVI came to the throne that he was appointed minister of France, a position in which his policies of justice and economy might have saved France had he been allowed to continue in office.

Voltaire, if not the greatest literary man of this time, is at least the best known to-day of the writers of the courts of Louis XV and Louis XVI, for his long life, beginning in the reign of Louis XIV, lasted until Louis XVI had mounted the throne.

He began as a poet and playwright and during his early years he was in constant trouble

from his sharp tongue and sharper pen, for he spared no one. He was often imprisoned for brief periods and exiled for longer ones. One of these exiles, which he spent in England, was the greatest formative influence of his career. Here he came in contact with a people more different from the French than any other in Europe, with ideas of freedom of speech and of the press far in advance of those of the French. He had an opportunity to view his country from the outside and to make comparisons. He had been a writer of facility and cleverness but he returned to France as a thinker with well defined views and a marvelous ability for expressing them, and easily took place as one of the foremost literary men of France.

Voltaire has been called an atheist, but this is not true. He was in revolt against outworn systems both of government and religion, and opposition to his views made him indulge in lampoons and satires in which his scorn of existing conditions was no doubt exaggerated. It is certain that he was a free thinker and did not follow out any particular religious belief, orthodox or otherwise. He was intensely jealous of every other writer and he was continually making new enemies. He had a brief season of popularity at court under the patronage of Pompadour, but for the greater part of his life he was exiled from Paris and when Frederick the Great of Prussia invited him to his court, he accepted.

Frederick the Great was the most imposing monarchical figure in Europe. In his ambitions and breadth of vision he approached the grandeur of Louis XIV. Time after time in his wars he had used France as a tool to gain his ends. He was, besides being a great statesman, a great student, and he had a genuine appreciation of Voltaire. In addition to this he realized that the residence of the great French writer at his court would not bring any pleasure to Louis XV. From the safe haven of a foreign country Voltaire could write such satires of prominent Frenchmen as he pleased. Had he confined his attacks to France all might have gone well with him, but his mischief-loving soul found much to ridicule in the Prussian court also, and Frederick the Great was compelled to send him back to France. These two men continued friends at a distance and Voltaire corresponded with Frederick until the day of his death.

The successors of Louis XIV were unable to perpetuate his ideal of the grand monarch—the ruler who should be absolute in power and both loved and feared by his subjects, but his ideals were carried on in Europe by Frederick II, called The Great, king of Prussia.

The father of Frederick the Great had so strong a dislike for everything that was not practical that he refused to let his son learn Latin, which only increased the boy's desire for learning. His

teachers were Frenchmen and he imbibed French ideals early. In young manhood he attracted about him men of letters from all over the world, especially France, and we have already told of his friendship for Voltaire.

Louis XIV had said "I am the State"; Frederick the Great made an equally famous remark. He said "I am but the first servant of the State." This sounded much more democratic, but in reality his meaning was the same as that of Louis the Magnificent, for though he was surrounded by ministers, they were little more than clerks who executed his will.

Frederick the Great revived the Prussian Academy of Sciences, which had fallen into decay under his father's practical regime. He did not, however, encourage letters in his own country. He spoke French as much as possible, wrote much, including some verse, in French, and regarded German as a barbarous language. He maintained feudalism, but he made all the great lords vassals of the crown. He was very much interested in maintaining absolute justice and would give his personal attention to the most unimportant cases. He established a religious freedom of speech such as had never been tolerated in any other country of Europe.

His neglect of German letters, Lessing, Goethe the poet, Kant the philosopher and many

others appeared in his time, has often been criticised, yet it is probable that modern German letters, which were then developing, achieved an originality of thought and conception which might not have been possible under royal patronage.

Louis XIV built the great palace of Versailles for himself; Frederick the Great lived much of his time in a mansion which he called *Sans Souci*, "Without Care," where he entertained Voltaire. A palace with the same name was built after the Seven Years' War in his reign, but it was never a favorite residence of his.

Frederick the Great differed from Louis XIV in that he thought more of the future of his country than of his own greatness. He devoted much time to the building of his army and to the country's finances. He carried on continuous wars of conquest, first gaining Silesia from Hungary. After the Seven Years' War he participated in the partition of Poland, gaining the greater part of Polish Prussia and Great Poland as far as the River Netze. He reduced many of the small German states to submission and laid the foundation for the present German Empire.

Voltaire was the apostle of thought. He demanded the reason and would not admit the truth of anything which could not be proved by personal experience or sensation. In this teaching he became very popular with the educated nobility,

who were more and more turning away from religion, partly through disgust for a clergy which had become dissolute and immoral, partly in justification of their own loose lives. Instead of following the teachings of those of the Catholic clergy who were really living up to their vows, or of the Protestants, these men preferred to turn from all religious belief, and they were delighted with the broad criticisms of Voltaire which they would not have dared make themselves. Voltaire's chief attacks were against the Catholic Church because that was the church then in power in France.

Contemporary with Voltaire were many other writers who were also trying to tear down old forms and beliefs and to put something new in their place. If Voltaire was the writer and leader of the intellectuals among the nobility, Jean Jacques Rousseau was the teacher of the common people. He was a vagabond political writer and novelist. In his work, *The Social Contract*, he was the first to consider from a modern viewpoint the relation of the people to the state and to claim that the people were governed because, whether consciously or unconsciously, they had entered into a contract with the state.

They obeyed its laws, paid the taxes, fought in its armies, and for this the state was supposed to give a return in protection and prosperity. He raised the definite question as to whether the

government of France was fulfilling its part of the contract toward the people. In addition to theorizing about the rights of the governed in *The Social Contract*, he expressed other ideas just as radical and just as dangerous to the political leaders of the day. In *The New Heloise*, a preachment in the guise of a romance, he recorded his ideas about love and marriage and advocated a return to nature and simplicity.

The lives and teachings of Voltaire and Rousseau were in many things curiously parallel. Both advocated freedom of thought, both lived most of their lives upon the charity of others, but Voltaire was by temperament an aristocrat while Rousseau was a man of the crowd, and during their lifetimes they were bitterly antagonistic. The social teachings of Rousseau had great influence on Lord Byron and John Ruskin.

Another great writer was Diderot, whose first work, *Letters to the Blind*, was an æsthetical treatise for which he was imprisoned. He was soon released and enabled to go on with his work of editing the *Encyclopedia* which the French philosophers of the time were compiling as a complete dictionary of classified knowledge. This work was inspired by the English philosophers Locke and Bacon, and almost all of the great writers of France contributed to it. Its preparation and publication occupied many years. As soon as a volume was published it met a storm of criticism from the

Church and from the more conservative Frenchmen. After the publication of the first two volumes in 1752 the books were suppressed by an edict of the Council. The continuation of the work was not forbidden but manuscripts and plates were seized by the authorities and not returned until three months later.

From 1753 the work went on without interruption, a fresh volume appearing each year. When the volumes were issued as far as the letter G, the work received another check. This was through the appearance of a book called *De l'Esprit*, by Helvetius, one of the French philosophers, a man of good birth who had occupied himself with literature for his own amusement. In his book he expressed the extreme of the materialistic views of the philosophers, and aroused such a protest from Church and court that the work was condemned to the flames and the opportunity seized for again forbidding the publication of the *Encyclopedia*.

The work of Diderot continued in secret and was finally published in full. Only after its appearance did Diderot find that his publisher, fearing that the book would be suppressed and he would lose his profit, had cut out parts of many of the articles which he thought would be most apt to offend the conservative element.

Thus it was that in the reign of Louis XV, one of the weakest of monarchs, the great men of

France were working to continue in their country the intellectual glory which should outlast wars and political disturbances.

At the same time commercial interests were not idle. During the reign of Louis XIV every known luxury had been imported to France, and wherever possible French manufacturers imitated the work of foreigners. Among other things Chinese porcelain was greatly valued. All over Europe manufacturers were trying to solve the secret of its composition, but without much success. Spain had received from the Moors the secret of tin-enamel, which spread a white coating over the outer surface of the clay, and this secret was carried to Italy during the Renaissance. The knowledge did not spread from one country to another, for the potters very very jealous of their secrets, but was discovered by painful and laborious work in each country individually.

A product very nearly approaching porcelain was manufactured both at Rouen and St. Cloud during the Seventeenth century. At Chantilly a factory was started under the patronage of the Prince de Condé in 1725, but the most important was the factory founded at Vincennes about 1740. Here was made the nearest approach to real porcelain which the French had been able to produce. In 1753 the factory was taken under the direct patronage of the king and three years after it was

moved to Sèvres, becoming the most important porcelain factory in France, though the product did not really deserve the name of porcelain until after the Revolution, which it survived.

Here for the first time truly French forms and decorations were used. There was no imitation of Hispano-Moorish, Chinese or Italian designs. Many of the shapes were designed by Duplessis, the king's silversmith. Enamel colors and gilding were used in their decoration as were also imitation jewels set in gold and silver. The most characteristic decoration is the panels painted with delicate miniatures, suggestive of the art of Watteau and Fragonard.

Other designs were the "biscuit" porcelains. These are decorated with figures which were modeled by the foremost sculptors of France, many suggested by the shepherds and shepherdesses of Watteau. They possess real artistic value, while the painted and jeweled Sèvres was more a marvel of mechanical perfection than of artistic skill.

Louis XV could afford to encourage art and industry at home, especially where it contributed to the luxury and comfort of his own life, but his timid soul and narrow vision could not comprehend wider commercial activities. At this time Holland, France and England all had colonies in India and America. The power of Spain in these countries was no longer to be feared, but with Holland, England and France

it was only a question of which country would develop and protect their interests with most intelligence. Especially in India was the competition between the French and English very keen.

Louis XIV had founded the French Indian Company to develop trade in these colonies, and while the company had not been tremendously successful, it had continued in existence. India was far away and the people in France regarded it as a sort of miracle country flowing with riches, but it did not seem real enough or near enough for the court to give the intelligent study and support which were needed at this time if France was to retain her holdings. After the death of Fleury relations between France and England were hostile and their wars in Europe were also prosecuted in the colonies.

During the reign of Louis XV several financiers of big vision built up great hopes on the Indian colonies. Joseph Dupleix dreamed of founding a French empire there. He was made governor of Pondicherry on the coast of Coromandel. Karikal belonged also to the French and Madras and Fort St. George belonged to the English. Here both countries maintained small armies, partly composed of natives and partly of European soldiers. It is unnecessary to go into the various battles fought in the Colonies, but the French were timid and distrustful of their colonists and slow to send rein-

forcements of troops, while the English gave support and intelligent co-operation to Clive, who was in command of their forces. Just when Dupleix might have won his cause he was recalled, in disgrace with the court, but regarded as a hero by the people. In 1761 Pondicherry surrendered to the English, thus marking the fall of French power and wealth in India, and Count Lally-Tolendal, who had defended French rights in India against almost unbelievable odds, was condemned to death for treason by the country he had served.

France was to be no more fortunate in her American Colonies. In the New World France had taken the lead in spreading civilization. Her colonists had come, not for gold alone, as had been the case with the Spanish, but to found, wherever they went, religious communities of homes which, while forming a source of revenue for France, were also to be centers of civilization whose influence spread to the lasting benefit of whatever country they colonized. The hopes of France were centered in Canada. The thirteen English North American colonies had been founded and during the reign of Louis XV these constituted a growing menace to the power of France in Canada.

The French colonists in Canada had at first devoted themselves to agriculture, but now commercial rivalry had sprung up between them and the English. The battle was very unequal. The

English were leaders in commerce, both because of their great navy and because the English laws were all devised to help free trade with her colonies and to develop their resources, while the French colonists could hope for little assistance from the mother country.

In 1745 the English captured Louisburg and the Island of Cape Breton. Louis XV was compelled to defend his colonies if he would preserve the national honor, but the French were far from confident. The French colonists in Canada and Louisiana did not number more than 80,000 inhabitants, while the English were 1,200,000.

The result was certain. Quebec surrendered September 18th, 1759. Montreal followed a few months later. Louisiana did not even take part in the war. In the final treaty it was ceded by the French to Spain in exchange for Florida, which was abandoned to the English. Thus through apathy and indifference France lost the great treasure which her missionaries and explorers had won through untold suffering and matchless bravery.

These losses added to the general discontent of the people and their lack of confidence in the government. In 1764 the Pompadour died and was succeeded in the king's affections by Madame Du Barry. The new favorite was less clever and ambitious than Pompadour had been, but she had more direct influence over the king. While Louis XV

was his own prime minister the various provinces had Parliaments and he was constantly opposing them. Weak and vacillating himself, he could not see any man who was stronger than he at the head of affairs.

During his reign the letters de cachet, of which his successor made such wholesale use, were first introduced. These were orders for the execution, imprisonment or exile of any individual, which the king signed, frequently without reading, often with no knowledge of who was the intended victim.

The financial condition of the country was constantly growing worse; disastrous wars depleted the treasury and the king was constantly placing new and heavier taxes on the people. At the same time the Jesuits, who had been among the largest financiers of France during the wars, and who were now unable to pay their obligations, were abolished as an order in France, following a previous action in Spain. This pleased the people, whose misery resented the prosperity of the clerical orders, but set a strong organization against the king.

At last some of the provincial Parliaments refused to register the edicts of the king for increased taxation and five members of the Parliament of Rennes were arrested. The prime minister under the king lost favor by trying to check Louis' harsh attitude toward the Parliaments and Du Barry formed a plot to remove him. He was dismissed in

1770 and the power passed into the hands of unscrupulous men following their own ambitions.

Too late the king ordered the magistrates to resume their functions and administer justice. "There is nothing left for your Parliament but to perish with the laws," they replied, "since the fate of the magistrates should go with that of the State."

Chancellor Maupeou succeeded in curtailing the power of the local Parliaments so that advocates tried all their cases before his court instead of before the provincial courts. This lessened the cost of administering justice, but the people were now occupied with something far more important, the cost of bread. There had been successive crop failures and some of the provincial Parliaments before their fall had accused the king of speculating in grain which should have gone to feed the people. This was called the Famine Pact, a phrase which soon spread among the mobs of Paris. The national debt continued to grow and Du Barry plunged the king and court into wilder extravagances than they had ever known previously. They occupied themselves with the theater, with balls and banquets, where men and women both drank to excess and used snuff. Smoking was not general in France at this time.

France had been scarcely more successful in Europe than in her colonies. Poland had been divided among the nations but France got no part

of it. She still retained the province of Lorraine and the island of Corsica, but her power in Europe was a thing of the past. Frederick II wrote: "France plays so small a part in Europe that I merely tell you about the impotent efforts of the French ministry's envy just to have a laugh at them and to let you see in what visions the consciousness of its own weakness is capable of leading that court to indulge."

At last Louis XV fell ill of smallpox. Du Barry was sent away, his intimates forsook him, and the king, who had always indulged in religious terror in times of illness, asked pardon for the scandal he had caused them. He died in 1774 at the age of sixty-four, unattended and unmourned, having reigned forty-nine years. He had earned the contempt of the other nations of Europe and the hatred of his own subjects and he left to Louis XVI a kingdom so weak and so divided in purpose that the doom of the French monarchy was already sealed. There were men who still hoped. The new king was young, but he was old enough to assume the nominal administration of affairs without a regency and for this the people were thankful.

It is reported that Louis XVI and his young wife, Marie Antoinette, when they received the news of the king's death, threw themselves on their knees and exclaimed: "O God, protect us, direct us; we are too young."

The Coming Storm

NEVER did king assume his crown at a more difficult time than did Louis XVI. Unlike his predecessors, he was simple in his tastes, moral in character, and more devoted to his wife than was good for the administration of his affairs, but he was filled with enthusiasm for the task before him and sincerely devoted to the best interests of his people so long as they were not opposed to royalism, for the traditions of absolute monarchy were as strong in him as they had been in Louis XV. Besides being young, the new king was not of a particularly strong character and even had he been, the kingdom was in such a state of disorder and he was surrounded by so many warring factions and so many evil counsellors that he could not have succeeded in his plans for reinstating the stability of the throne and the prosperity of the country.

Intellectually France had struck a new note. The work of Rousseau, which had little influence during his life, began to bear fruit in the new

craze of simplicity and naturalness. The ideas of Voltaire which had been discussed in the salons of France, began to take definite form. They had spread by degrees from the intellectuals and the nobility to the common people, and while the country folk were still living the quiet, unthinking lives of their ancestors, bearing their increasing burden of toil and poverty in silence, the people of the cities were all awake and every beggar had his own ideas of politics.

In art the transition is easily followed. The decorative style of Watteau had been followed by the more sensual conceptions of Fragonard and Boucher. With the adoption of simplicity in ideals there was a classical reaction in painting. This was led by J. M. Vien, who became director of the French Academy at Rome. Under him studied Jacques Louis David, who was to become the leading classic painter of France. Born twenty-eight years before Louis XVI ascended to the throne, he lived to cast a vote for the death of the king who had befriended him and to exercise his art during the Napoleonic era.

David went to Rome with Vien, where the classic reaction began, and returning to France he became painter to Louis XVI and his popularity was as instantaneous as it was great. The Loves of Antiochus and Stratonice won for him the Prix de Rome. This was followed by the Grief of Andro-

made, The Oath of the Horatii, The Death of Socrates, and many great canvases devoted to similar classical subjects.

Previous to this time the dramatists had been imitating the Greek and Roman models, bringing so little imagination to these modern copies of the work of the ancients that nothing worthy of long life was produced. Before the Revolution this imitation of the ancients was to attain such vogue that even the dress and manners of ancient Rome were affected by some of the nobility.

The effect of the classic reaction in architecture was seen in hundreds of beautiful buildings of the Roman style, erected in Paris and other important cities in France. This architectural revival of the classic was greatly influenced by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, the Italian engraver, who was born early in the Eighteenth century. The ruins at Rome, where he studied his art, kindled his enthusiasm and he went about making faithful and artistic etchings of the buildings and monuments, catching the design of the original architect and filling in the parts that were no longer existant. His enthusiasm grew as his work progressed and he was compelled to have the assistance of his two children, whom he trained to aid him. His engravings were eventually taken to France, where they were published and added materially to the revival of the love of classical simplicity.

Furniture and interior decorations were being influenced by the Adams brothers of England, who visited Paris at the time. They were architects, but their greatest expression was found in the furniture which they designed to fit the classic dwellings, and the voluptuous flower-garlanded cupids and nude Venuses gave way to the classic urn and the acanthus medallion, the straight lines and simple ornamentation of the Adam period.

With the passion for simplicity there was also an insatiable curiosity. People delved into all sorts of new discoveries and researches, they adopted every kind of cult and ism that presented itself. Mesmer, the German, came to Paris and people flocked to see his exhibitions of hypnotic power and believed it could cure all the diseases of mankind. There was an effort on the part of all people to return to nature, to discover and master her forces.

Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, born in 1743, was now writing of science in a way that the common people could understand, making of it, instead of something abstract, a thing of interest which could be put to everyday use. In 1776 he received a gold medal from the Academy of Sciences for an essay on the best means of lighting a town. He wrote about thunder and the aurora, he analyzed gypsum, and refuted the then prevalent belief that water by repeated distillation could be turned into earth.

Like the artist David and most of the scientists and artists of the time, he was not content with researches alone but desired to make practical use of his knowledge. With this in view he held many political posts. He improved the manufacture of gunpowder, and in the position of a member of the committee on agriculture, he drew up reports and instructions as to the cultivation of various crops. He was the first man to suggest the establishment of agricultural experiment stations, the distribution of agricultural instruments and the regulation of pasturage rights. His life was long and active, but as his honors and responsibilities increased so did his enemies, and he fell with hundreds of others of the truly great men of France, a victim of the guillotine. His later work and his death belong to the story of the Revolution.

With science and art, literature was also progressing. Bernadin de Saint-Pierre published his *Etudes de la Nature*, and *Paul and Virginia*, a sentimental novel which is still read. Buffon, the great naturalist, who had recreated in Paris the *Jardin du Roi* and had written his natural history and many other works relating to nature study, was still alive and writing at the beginning of this era. Great sailors and explorers were constantly returning to Paris to enrich the *Jardin du Roi* with rare specimens collected in every part of the globe.

Both men and women were interested in the new developments. Ladies of fashion crowded to hear the lectures of learned scientists. De Bougainville had completed the circle of the globe. De Montgolfier and Pilatre de Rozier were making the first experiments in aerial locomotion. It was an age of new thought, new ideas, new achievements.

The learned men who discussed theories in salons and academies were giving place to the men who put their theories into effect. There was a passion for exact knowledge which was expressed in the engravings of the time. These were often made in outline, showing that the interest now centered in the situation rather than in the personalities that composed it. Frequently the work was not done by one man. An artist, an etcher and a line engraver often combined on one piece of work, thus producing an engraving which was technically perfect but was not great art.

One of the greatest factors for keeping the general public informed of the trend of affairs was the now rapidly increasing number of newspapers in France. The first newspaper had been started in 1632 under the direct patronage and with the co-operation of Richelieu. In 1752 the title of *Gazette de France* was given to this publication. It contained the state news and court circulars as well as the gossip and satirical verses which pleased the

people of the time. The *Mercure Galant* was established in 1672, with Corneille as sub-editor. Its name was afterwards changed to *Nouveau Mercure* and later to *Mercure de France*. During the reign of Louis XVI this became the most important political journal in France. It was an ardent advocate of all the new reforms.

In 1789 the *Moniteur* was established under the same general management as the *Mercure*, but with directly opposite political leanings. It was the newspaper of the court and the support of the royalists. The marked contrast of these two journals under one proprietor was so evident that one republican writer depicted him as Janus with one face radiant at the blessings of coming liberty while the other was overcast with grief for the passing of the old order.

Meanwhile Louis XVI was struggling to adjust himself to the obvious duties and doubtful privileges of kingship, while his Austrian wife was rapidly making herself unpopular, one of the great tragedies of a tragic time.

Marie Antoinette was a woman of simple tastes and sweet though not strong character, who would have lived a happy and untroubled existence in almost any position save that of queen of France. Her husband loved her and she had presented him with an heir to the throne, but the whole life of the court of France was distasteful to her. Under Louis

XIV and Louis XV an exaggerated system of formal court etiquette had grown up which not only the courtiers, but the people themselves, expected to be maintained.

The people were prejudiced against her in the first place because of her Austrian birth. They hated everything German. They could not understand why she secluded herself in the Trianon and why she did not interest herself in the formal pleasures and ceremonies of the court. Instead of attributing her actions to a love for simplicity, they creating all sorts of scandal about her life. Her own indiscretions made these things worse. In her desire for affection she became the tool of the men and women whom she made her friends and through her they sought and secured positions of importance which they in no way deserved, for Louis XVI was weak enough to grant all of the demands of his simple-minded but capricious wife, in spite of his own better judgment.

One of the first acts of Louis XVI was to banish Du Barry from the court. He next dismissed most of the ministers who had surrounded his grandfather and put in their place men whom he deemed worthy and competent to make the reforms which were necessary for the good of France. De Maurepas, who had been banished by Louis XV for writing songs disrespectful toward the Pompadour, was summoned to his side as minister. Turgot

was made Minister of Marine, and was soon made comptroller-general in place of Abbe Terray.

The king placed implicit confidence in Turgot and in his plans for reorganizing the financial system of France. Two principles animated the policy of Turgot; economy of expenditure and freedom for trade. He made the most careful investigations, abolishing many useless and expensive offices. In all this the king was giving his support, but Turgot feared the return of the old Parliament, a fear which was justified, but yielding to de Maurepas, who was influenced by what he believed to be the public opinion, the old Parliaments were soon restored all over France. Limited in their power at first, the king was forced to make concession after concession, until the Parliaments were free to interfere with and hamper the administration, though they could not change it.

Meanwhile Turgot was making plans for a redistribution and equalization of the taxes. He was also planning a graduated scale of municipal assemblies, beginning with the parish and ending in a general meeting of delegates from each province. He was trying to improve the general condition of the peasants, to fit them for thus participating in this more representative form of government. Naturally these plans often interfered with the privileges of the nobility and the clergy, and so met with powerful opposition.

Necker, a banker from Geneva, who had settled in Paris, had written a book about the grain trade. He did not altogether agree with Turgot and when he asked Turgot's approval of his work, Turgot told him to publish it and let the people decide. This was done and the book had an immense sale. Other literature of a similar nature but from less reliable sources was also published and riots broke out in the streets of Paris where drunken men shouted, "bread, cheap bread."

Turgot always believed that these riots were incited by some of the nobles who wished to overthrow him, but he could not prove it. The ministry was in the hands of the reformers for a time. Louis XVI was anxious to be just and tolerant and Turgot and de Malesherbes, another minister who was seconding his efforts, urged Louis to give Protestants a civil status, while the clergy were trying to persuade him to continue the work of Louis the Magnificent and Louis the Well Beloved, in oppressing the heretics.

Malesherbes was the first to protest against the *lettres de cachet*. He visited the Bastille and released a number of prisoners who had been arrested on suspicion, some of whom did not even know of what they had been accused.

All of the reformers were trying to effect radical changes in all too short a time. The Count de St. Germain, who now had charge of the war

department, tried to inject German discipline in the French army, but the men protested so loudly that his plans were abandoned. In speaking of corporal punishment, which he wanted to introduce, a grenadier said, "In the matter of sabres I like only the edge."

His failure, like every other failure of the administration, was laid at the door of Turgot, who continued bravely in his work of reform, but every day he was making new enemies. He persuaded the king to sign two important edicts; one abolishing jurorships and masterships among workmen, these being two of the survivals of the old guilds, and their abolishment gave every workman the right to pursue his trade independently. The other was an edict abolishing corvees throughout the entire kingdom and substituting an impost on all property owners. For the first time those who were best equipped financially were to bear a just share of the burden of taxation, but these edicts sealed the doom of Turgot. The king could no longer withstand the pressure brought to bear and Turgot was removed from office. He was soon followed by de St. Germain, and the last glory of the French monarchy went with them.

In the meantime the American colonies were becoming dissatisfied with English rule and preparing to form an independent government. The French, humiliated by their inglorious part in

the Seven Years' War which had just closed, were eagerly watching for an opportunity to injure England. They had agents in the American colonies who anticipated the trouble even before it broke. A company was organized to send money to the colonies and when war was declared many Frenchmen went to their aid against the English. Louis XVI himself maintained a neutral attitude. He would not give his consent to soldiers who desired to enlist in the cause of the colonists, but many went without his permission. Among these was the young Marquis de Lafayette, who was among the first to inspire confidence in the French and their disinterested help, in the mind of General Washington.

"It is my line to be a royalist," said the Austrian Emperor Joseph II, when pressed to declare in favor of the American insurgents. Louis XVI was of the same opinion and while his people were giving generous military and financial aid to the Americans, he did not acknowledge their independence until he was sure they were going to be victorious.

This aid which the French gave to the Americans naturally brought about hostilities between France and England at the same time, hostilities prosecuted at sea and in the Indian colonies where the French were still trying to maintain a foothold.

Spain also consented to take a part in the war, though at first Charles III had feared what the effect might be upon his own colonies in America. Spain entered the conflict without any formal declaration of war and without formally recognizing the independence of the American colonies.

When peace was finally restored France came out exhausted but with a re-established self-respect. She had gained from the English a part of her old Indian possessions, Pondicherry, Chander-nugger and Karikal, although only a bit of what had once been a great French dominion; and in the exchange of conquests England had gained Gibraltar.

In her generous and disinterested espousal of what she deemed the cause of right and justice in America, France had further fertilized the soil of national discontent from which was to spring the Revolution in her own land.

Turgot had been followed by useless and inefficient ministers, and at last Necker was called to the post. He had been a banker and was a Protestant, a fact which raised such a protest from the clergy that he never assumed the title of Comptroller-General, though that was the office he filled, and he was not admitted to the Council. Born in Switzerland, he was a student of international law and had written books on that subject. He came to Paris first as clerk in a bank owned by a friend of his father. In connection with another man he

established a bank of his own in Paris and he and his partner, who managed a branch in London, became very rich in grain speculation and by loans to the government.

His wife, who had political ambitions for her husband, established a salon which was much frequented by the notables of the time. We have already mentioned the book which Necker published, which attacked the free trade policies of Turgot. Necker was a banker, not an economist, and it was as a banker that he applied himself to the financial problems of France, when he at last became minister of finance. He made a more equal division of the taxes and founded the *Monts de Piété* where the State loaned money on personal security at reasonable interest, thus relieving the poor from usury. So great was the confidence of the country in his financial ability that he was able to contract loans for the state to the extent of five hundred million livres without giving security of any kind to the lenders. The very boldness of his operations tended to bring about his downfall. As a foreigner he had no reverence for the French customs and traditions. He abolished useless offices and prerogatives which had been a source of revenue to the nobles and of expense to the government. In 1781 he published his "*Compte rendu au Roi*," a statement of the government finances.

He had made up his mind to let the people know how the nation's finances were handled. Such a thing had never been done before in the history of France, and this action was the end of his public career, at least for a time. He had lasted five years and had won the enmity of the magistrates, whose authority he had reduced, and of the nobles, whose revenue he had abolished. This last act of the *Compte rendu au Roi* crystallized all the opposition against him, and he was forced to resign. Many historians attribute his resignation directly to Marie Antoinette, and it is certain that her influence was felt in the matter, though the nobles would probably have succeeded in removing him even without her help.

This was the first of many interferences in politics which the young queen made at the instigation of the friends who "loved her for herself." She knew nothing of politics or of government but she wanted to please her friends, so she went on to her ruin oblivious of the criticism of the court and the growing hatred of the people.

De Calonne succeeded Necker in the office on the 30th of October, 1784. His policy was the exact opposite of that of Turgot. He believed in a deceptive display of wealth and indulged in the most extravagant expenditures. His ideas and principles were no less opposed to the morality and conservatism of his king.

"A man who wants to borrow," he said, "must appear rich, and to appear rich he must dazzle by his expenditures. Economy is good for nothing, it warns those who have money not to lend it to an indebted treasury, and it causes decay among the arts which prodigality vivifies." It is easy to see how this policy plunged the country into still greater distress, through the arts in which Calonne professed such an interest did not decay.

It was at this time that Beaumarchais was creating his famous comedy character, Figaro. The character is first seen in his *Barbier de Seville*, then in the *Mariage de Figaro* and the *Folle Journée*. These society comedies were tremendously successful. Through Figaro, a bold, clever and impertinently roguish fellow, the playwright Beaumarchais ridiculed everything and everybody. The *Mariage de Figaro* especially was vastly popular, and the German composer, Mozart, who was then traveling about from one European court to another, appreciated to some extent but living in poverty, chose the comedy as the basis for an opera of the same name.

To fully understand the conditions in France which caused the general dissatisfaction leading up to the Revolution, it is necessary to outline briefly the form of government which had superseded the feudal system, and which was in use at the time of the ascension of Louis XVI to the throne.

The desire of his predecessors to remove all power from the feudal lords and to centralize government in the person of the king had been carried too far. While there were a number of bodies under the king which were supposed to have executive and administrative powers, they were really powerless to oppose the king, and he could approve or veto any of their measures without explaining in the least the meaning or reason for his acts. Even a king with a natural aptitude for government would have found the administration of justice almost impossible under these conditions. Louis XVI had no real ability or liking for statecraft and was made the tool of any person who happened to be in his confidence or in the favor of the unpopular queen.

The central governing power of the state was vested in the King's Councils. These were five in number; the Council of Parties, or Privy Council, was the largest and was supposed to be a training school for the other four, the Council of State, Council of Dispatches, Council of Finance and Council of Commerce.

The king was supposed to sit with all of these Councils. The Comptroller of Finances was a member of the Councils; the King's Chancellor was a member of three of them. As these were the most important men in the country their presence in several of the Councils secured unity of action.

The Privy Council was composed of the important members of all the other Councils, thirty Councilors of State and eighty lawyers.

Under the direction of each Council there were a number of public offices, called bureaux, in which minor details of government were settled. The powers of each Council were not definitely outlined. Different matters were referred to different Councils, as chance or influence dictated, and always the action of the Council was subject to recall or veto by the king. Everything was referred to him for final decision.

All the legislative or law-making power was vested in the Councils and much of the judiciary power as well. The custom of removing cases from the smaller courts and bringing them before the Councils, which really meant trying them before the king, was very common. A bridge could not be built or a church repaired in the most remote village without a written permission signed by the king.

The royal Councils and their bureaux had agents in the provinces called Intendants, which office has been referred to in connection with Turgot. There were thirty-two of these intendants, each governing a province or *généralité*. These men were not great nobles and their office was not based on inherited or property rights. They were appointed by the Council and could be removed,

transferred, promoted or deposed at the royal pleasure. These intendants could sit in any court of law in the province which they controlled and their powers were very great and often much abused. They rarely had any real interest in their provinces and often lived the year around at the courts of Versailles or Paris.

The intendant had charge of the affairs of both Catholics and Protestants in his province; he regulated agriculture and commerce, he managed the militia, had charge of post roads, post offices, stage coaches, censored books and printing and supervised the lotteries licensed by the court.

Their opportunities for doing good or harm were almost unlimited, and they were often transferred from one province to another before they had an opportunity of learning the real needs of the people whom they were supposed to serve, even had they been sufficiently interested. They were for the most part self-seeking, striving only to please the king and the Council which had appointed them, with very little care as to the welfare of the people.

In addition to the intendant there was a governor in each province, a survival of the feudal system, whose duties had been largely taken over by the intendant and who merely remained as a useless official, usually receiving an extravagantly high salary.

We have mentioned that one official could be at one time a member of several of the Councils. In this way the power of the government was really vested in the hands of a few men. A parallel is found in the overlapping directorates of supposedly rival companies in a modern trust. Thus France was governed by what would now be called a political "ring."

In such a condition it is easy to see how there was no uniformity of law and justice in France. The taxes levied in the different provinces were unequal. Bribery, graft and injustice flourished and the depravity of the court could no longer be hidden from a people who had read the works of Voltaire, Turgot, Rousseau and Diderot.

The successful revolution of the English colonies in America crystallized their dissatisfaction and they now knew what they wanted; a government in which all the people should have a voice, in which justice should be the same for the noble and the working man, in which taxation should be equal and privilege should be abolished.

No great reform is ever brought about by conservatives or by those who see clearly both sides of a question. The reformer must be an intense partisan and all over France agitators were springing into prominence whose activities were prompted not so much by love for people and liberty as by hatred of the nobility which had for

centuries oppressed them. This hatred for the nobility centered about the person of the unfortunate queen, Marie Antoinette, "the Austrian," as she was called.

Unpopular with the court because of her desire to avoid its ceremony and pomp, she was even more unpopular with the people, because in the diversion which she found in the Trianon and in the salons of her ill-chosen favorites, she was as extravagant in her unconventional pleasures as the women of the court of Louis XV had been in their formal court gayeties.

The queen's enemies at court encouraged the hatred of the people in every possible way, and it is difficult to state at this time how many of the stories told of Marie Antoinette were true and how many were falsehoods created by the malice of those whom she opposed in their ambitious intrigues.

Marie Antoinette cannot be blamed for her aversion to the rigid court etiquette which gave her no moment of privacy. Even her morning toilet was made a wearisome ceremony in which each separate garment was handed to her by a specially designated lady in waiting. Unfortunately, when she fled the ceremony of the court she took refuge in the society of people of questionable standards. She gambled recklessly, though Louis XVI disapproved of gambling, and was seen at public

masqued balls where common women were admitted to dance with the nobles. She refused to exercise economy even in the time of France's greatest need, and there was much to criticise in her thoughtless conduct, even had her enemies confined themselves to the truth. Her personal allowance was much greater than that of the previous queen, yet she was frequently in debt.

It was not until after the removal of Necker from the office of Comptroller General that Marie Antoinette began her disastrous interference with public affairs. Then it was only to please her favorites. It was her friend Madame de Polignac who secured the appointment of Calonne as Comptroller General in place of Necker.

Calonne's policy was one of reckless extravagance. Believing that the only way to establish credit was by making a great show of wealth, there is no doubt that his administration precipitated the Revolution, which was now inevitable.

The people of France were at this time divided into three estates, the nobility, the commons and the clergy. The laws governing these three classes of people, the privileges belonging to them, were all different, and when the rights and privileges of the nobility and clergy were satisfied, there was little left for the common people.

There were in France at the time over one hundred thousand people vowed to some form of

Catholic religious belief. These included the inhabitants of monasteries and nunneries as well as the parish priests, bishops and higher ecclesiastics. They all enjoyed special privileges, not only in France, but among the Catholic clergy of the world, for since the time of Francis I the French bishops had been appointed by the king, the Pope reserving only the right to veto such appointments. The French Church sent a certain revenue to Rome, but it was small in comparison with the great wealth which it possessed. It owned from one-fifth to one-fourth of the soil in France. In its capacity as landlord it was better than the laymen, for the prelate lived on his estate and was in direct touch with his tenants. The Church lands were the best cultivated in France. If the abbot of a monastery went to live at court his prior and monks remained to administer affairs and see that the farmers were cared for as well as the lands. To their wealth of lands the clergy steadily added the tithes which every layman in France paid to the Church. These were divided into great and little tithes. The great tithes were a tax on corn, wine and other large crops; the little tithes were on smaller crops. The tithes, despite their name, were seldom a tenth of the crop.

It was not alone the wealth of the Church and the innumerable tithes which were exacted that had made the people dissatisfied, but the spirit of worldliness which had centered into some of its

institutions. The parish priests, the majority of the lesser clergy and some of the higher prelates, were still devoted and self-denying, an honor to their calling, but the vows of poverty and seclusion from the world were largely forgotten by those connected with the court.

The Church, while dependent to some extent on the general laws of the country, had an independent government of its own. It paid no taxes to the crown but each year made a "Free Gift." One year the suppression of Voltaire's works was made a condition of the payment of the "Free Gift" and one year it was not paid at all because of a quarrel between the Church and the State.

The Catholic religion was the only recognized faith. Marriage could not be legally performed by any but a priest and the children of Protestants were considered illegitimate. Their property was often taken from them and given to the nearest Catholic relative. The laws in this regard were very harsh, but the judges fortunately did not always adhere strictly to the letter of the written law.

But the most formidable enemies of the Catholic Church were not Protestants. They were at that time too weak numerically to form a dangerous rival. The great undermining influence at work was found in the writers and philosophers whose work has been described. Through their

teaching a great wave of agnosticism and atheism was sweeping over the country, embracing not only the intellectuals but many of the simple, uneducated people, who saw in the teachings of Rousseau the doorway to a new freedom, and over whom the Church had largely lost its influence.

The second of the estates in France was that of the nobility. The nobility was a very large class, comprising practically all those who had money enough to live without labor. In England only the eldest son, who inherited the title of his father, was considered a noble and the title had come to be considered more like an honorable office than a mere matter of birth. In France all of the children of a noble were considered noble also, and their children after them. The family name made good their claims to nobility.

The nobles who were possessed of large estates and wealth lived all the time at court and left their business affairs and duties as landlords to agents, who often both oppressed their tenants and cheated their masters. Only the poorer nobles lived on their estates and here a very fine spirit often existed between lords and tenants. Presents were exchanged between the cottages and the chateau, the peasants rejoiced and shared in the family celebrations of the nobles and the harsh justice of the old order was softened by the leniency of the overlord. However, these conditions were rare. Many

of the nobles had no estates at all. They went into the army, getting long furloughs which they spent at court, living beyond their means and intriguing to get offices or commissions which would afford them more wealth.

Even among the nobles there was a division of prestige and privilege. The older families, which could trace their titles to the days of the crusades, considered themselves superior to the families with titles less old, and there was, as in every country, the supremacy which wealth always gives. Under the reforms of Louis XVI, in the attempt to cut down expenses, many of the privileges of these great nobles were cut off and their discontent was almost as great as that of the common people. Under Louis XV only nobles could obtain commissions in the army. Under Louis XVI the rule was broken to some extent and it was possible for common soldiers to obtain preferment. This was more often bought through money or friendship than through valor or distinguished service, but it added another grievance to the list of those which were daily widening the breach between the common people and the nobility.

There was much to commend in the lives of the nobles of this time, in spite of privilege, idleness and license. Social graces were cultivated as never before and they were more than surface manifestations. Young men as well as young girls made

a debut on entering society and were as carefully trained in etiquette as were their sisters. This training included a formal respect for women and for men older than themselves and the ability to render the exact amount of courtesy due to each person's rank. They were taught to be loyal in their friendships, brave in defense of their honor, soft spoken and quiet in demeanor. They were in fact reserved and amiable, their sins being rather those of omission than of commission. So long as they could live luxuriously at court they did not trouble themselves about their own estates or about the condition of the country in general.

Meantime the Third Estate, the common people, were growing poorer and more dissatisfied with the old order. They were especially opposed to the militia. This body was not large, but the term of service was six years and the members did not volunteer but were drafted. Men with dependent parents, apothecaries, many of the head servants on estates and others, were exempt from this duty. There were so many people with special privilege of immunity from military service that soldiers were drafted entirely from the poorest of the peasantry. The introduction of Prussian discipline in the regular army had been the beginning of dissatisfaction among the men and lower officers, which was to some extent to ally the army with the mob in the Revolution that was impending.

Even in the Third Estate there was no uniformity of condition and privilege. Corporations, guilds, cities and whole provinces possessed rights distinct from those of the rest of the people. Paris was at this time the chief city of Europe and it was growing rapidly. Building operations were so numerous that masons worked all night and masters of the trade in some instances were able to acquire independent fortunes. There were, in addition to the palaces of Versailles, three royal residences in Paris. The Luxembourg, which was the residence of the king's oldest brother, is still standing, little changed. Its gardens were then, as now, a public park. The Palace of the Louvre has been much enlarged and the Palace of the Tuileries is no longer in existence, though its gardens still remain. Here women came, borne by servants, in sedan chairs, to enjoy the terraces and walks, the green trees and the fresh air.

The whole life of France was one series of startling contrasts. In some of the provinces there were peaceful peasants tilling the soil and living in semi-prosperous contentment. On a neighboring estate were peasants of the same social station but weighted with oppression and fully alive to the injustice of their condition, grumbling and waiting only a spark to turn them into barbarous savages thirsting for the blood of the hated nobility.

In the cities it was the same. Prosperous tradesmen and workers lived side by side with innumerable beggars and large families of poorer workmen crowded into small dark rooms which have no parallel even in the worst of modern slums.

Except for the few boulevards which were the fashionable drives, the streets were narrow. The streets had no sidewalks and were filled with mud from summer rains or winter snows. The only drainage was provided by the gutters which ran down the center or on each side of the street. The carriages of the nobility dashed through these narrow streets flanked on each side with tall, gloomy houses, splashing mud on pedestrians and running down those who were not nimble enough to get out of the way.

The streets of Paris in spite of all this must have presented a gay and colorful sight. Street musicians and ballad singers stood on the corners, great signs swung from the shop windows or over the doors, proclaiming the wares within. The people themselves, both men and women, were gaily dressed. The men had begun to dress more simply as to style and cut of apparel but they still wore gay colors. A striped coat and light colored knee breeches in the gayest or most delicate shades, white stockings and low-cut shoes, and the cocked hat, are identified with Revolutionary days both in Europe and America. Wigs had been discarded,

but the men powdered their own hair and still wore it long enough to tie behind with a black ribbon. Two watches, rings, snuff boxes and shoe and garter buckles formed the more obvious adornments; and lace cuffs added a touch of daintiness.

The dress of the women was no less picturesque, though less graceful. The hairdresser built up a huge structure, sometimes three feet high, on their heads. Wide hoops and long, tight waists were the correct thing. Even the poorer people loved dress, for Paris had already become the fashion center of the world and sent dressed dolls to the different capitals of Europe to show the styles, and the people would go hungry to dress gaily.

Sordid poverty, ostentatious wealth, dainty apparel and unbelievable dirt walked hand in hand in Paris. There were few facilities for preserving food and the common people bought only enough for one meal at a time. Coffee had become a universal beverage and was sold on the streets at two sous a cup.

During the fifteen years which preceded the meeting of the States General, which was the real beginning of the Revolution, all sorts of changes were being made in French thought and manners. The influence of the American Revolution cannot be estimated, for in this revolt the philosophers saw their dreams of democracy put into actual effect.

Meantime England, with its more liberal ideas, was exercising a great influence on the French people. From England came the idea for the first clubs which began to spring up all over France, private clubs and public reading rooms where discussion of religion and politics was forbidden by law but where the law was never enforced.

The very limitations of the press made the writing and reading of revolutionary and democratic literature all the more attractive. The newspapers were more or less under the control of the government but it was practically impossible to suppress all the pamphlets which were issued, criticising the extravagance of Calonne and discussing quite frankly the vices and mistakes of people in high places. The bookstalls were crowded and everyone was writing. France had not one great question to settle but a thousand. Everything was in doubt, religion, politics, public life, private life, domesticity, morals, nothing was left undiscussed and every man had a different solution to offer.

The condition of France, except financially, was not really worse than the condition of other countries of Europe. The people were as prosperous and as comfortable, but mentally they had outgrown their political condition and they were intellectually in advance of the rest of Europe. Schiller, Goethe and Lessing had appeared in Ger-

many. But they were not then as well known among the common people in Germany as were the great writers in France.

The French people were more discontented than uncomfortable. Liberty and equality had become their watchwords and with them a new word, humanity. People had begun to consider the misfortunes of others. Hospitals were being established to care for the poor. Charity was beginning to take on a more practical form than that of indiscriminate alms giving.

We have seen how the three estates had each a certain amount of voice in their own government. That is, the Church had laws of government distinct from the laity; there were civil courts for the Third Estate, the people; above all were the nobles possessing rights and privileges distinct from either of these and the inner circle of greater nobility represented in the court around the person of Louis XVI—the “ring,” which was the real governing power of France.

For over one hundred and fifty years the States General, consisting of representatives of all of these estates, had not met. The disastrous financial policy of Calonne had thoroughly aroused the people, both nobles and commoners. When Calonne became Comptroller General he found a debt of six hundred million dollars and no money in the treasury and no credit. At first his whole effort was

directed toward establishing credit. He made a recoinage of gold and tried to establish public confidence in the solvency of the government. His next step was to suppress the internal customs which had been levied on goods passing from one province to another and to tax the property of nobles and the clergy. The privileged nobles were much angered at this step. Calonne, displeased at their criticism, published an account of the nation's finances for all to read and thus alienated the court. He was dismissed in 1787 and exiled to Lorraine. The people called him "Monsieur Deficit." His place was taken by Loménie de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse.

Brienne followed the same extravagant policy that had marked the administration of Calonne, and the rural Parliaments, which had hoped for a reinstatement of Necker, who had now become a popular hero, were more dissatisfied than ever. They demanded a meeting of the States General. At last their requests were granted; Necker was reinstated and in 1789 a meeting of the States General was called in an effort to untangle the complicated financial difficulties of France.

The hopes of the people ran high. They believed that some method would be devised by which the Third Estate would be entirely freed from taxation and the expenses of the government would be entirely carried by the Church and the

nobility. Even Louis XVI looked forward to the developing of a happy and loyal nation of which he would still be the undisputed head. The only people who were dissatisfied were the great nobles of the court, who saw their ancient rights and privileges slipping from their grasp.

The great problem confronting Necker was not confined to a settlement of the financial difficulties of France. He had to devise some way in which the three estates, composed of people whose ideals, ambitions and mode of life had for so many years been utterly different, could be brought together on a common ground.

The time for the calling of the States General was in many ways a most unfavorable one. The crops that year had failed and bread was so scarce that bakers were allowed to sell only a small piece to one person, and even the people of wealth were supposed to bring their own bread with them when they were invited out to dinner. Thousands of the poor had flocked to Paris in search of work or drawn by the general interest which was felt in the meeting of the States General. All over France and in America, where great interest was manifested in French affairs, there was a feeling that the difficulties of the nation would be adjusted "without one drop of bloodshed."

The first thing to decide was whether the three estates should act separately or collectively

in the meeting of the States General, and as to what percent of each body should be represented in a common meeting. The deputies of the Third Estate were strongly in favor of collective action. Only in this way could they be sure of a majority of the reformers being in power to abolish the last vestiges of the feudal system and bring about a system of government which would assure justice to the common people.

It was arranged that the States General was to consist of one thousand members, half of whom were to be drawn from the Third Estate, the other half from the First and Second Estates equally. The number of deputies was later increased, but its proportions remained the same.

It must not be thought that the deputies from the Third Estate were uneducated men. Of the first six hundred and twenty-one delegates from the Third Estate, two-thirds were lawyers or officials and many others were philosophers and scholars. All the deputies came with "cahiers" or written instructions as to what the people they represented wanted from the government.

On May 4th, 1789, all the delegates had arrived in Versailles and marched in a gorgeous procession to the Church of St. Louis to attend Mass. First came the Third Estate, dressed in black with cocked hats and white cravats; then came the nobility in bright colored court dress, and last the

clergy, dressed in somber black robes or elaborated ceremonial dress, according to their rank.

Louis XVI opened the meeting of the States General on the fifth of May at the palace of Versailles. Then ensued a struggle as to whether separate or combined meetings of the three estates should be held, a discussion as to the various powers of the deputies and as to whether they should vote by person or by order. If they voted by person each deputy would have a vote; if they voted by order the deputies of the First and Second Estates would have two votes to each one of the Third Estate.

At last the majority of the clergy got together with the commoners and formed what they called the National Assembly. The nobles sought the aid of the king to fight this organization. When the National Assembly gathered at their hall for a meeting on the twentieth of June they found the doors locked and guarded. They marched to a great building near the palace, which was used as a tennis court, and there swore the Oath of the Tennis Court, never to separate until they had drawn up a constitution for France.

The break between the nobles and the Third Estate was complete. The king now called for a royal session in which all the deputies should join. When they had assembled he commanded that the deputies from the three estates should retire to different chambers to draw up their plans

for government, commanding that they should not touch upon the army, feudal dues or tithes. The nobles and part of the clergy retired but the other deputies remained in their seats.

Mirabeau, probably the greatest intellectual of the Third Estate, rose and said that they were there by the will of the people and would not leave except at the point of the bayonet.

This speech was not the beginning of the Revolution. Its beginning was years before in the despotic grandeur of the court of Louis XIV, but these were the first public words of rebellion against the king himself, spoken by a man of importance, at a time when such words assumed the weight of acts that could not be rebuked by the king or court.

The Revolution

THE king struggled for several days with the members of this new born National Assembly, trying to force them to vote with the other two estates, thus giving the nobles and the clergy a majority of the votes. When the weak king found that he could not force the commoners, he reversed his decision and ordered the nobles and clergy to vote by person as the Third Estate desired. After some dissension this was accomplished and on the 27th of June, 1789, the three estates united in forming the National Constituent Assembly, pledged to provide a constitution for France.

To understand the events that followed one must realize that up to this time France knew nothing of representative government. The Assembly met without any knowledge of parliamentary law and with no recognized leader. There were, however, men who led to some extent by sheer power of personality, knowledge and zeal. Of these one of the most prominent was Honoré Gabriel Riqueti Mirabeau.

Mirabeau belonged to a family which had only two generations before made a fortune as merchants, with which they had purchased the seigniority of Mirabeau in Provence. He therefore belonged to the lesser nobility. For years he had been a prominent figure in Europe, partly because of his numerous love affairs, partly through his political writings and a brief diplomatic service in which he visited Prussia. He was at the Prussian court at the time when Frederick the Great died, but he was not fitted for a diplomatic career. He was too frank in his speech, too impulsive and fearless and he did not make friends with William, who succeeded Frederick. He spent some time in England, where he studied their system of parliamentary government. He had written a number of important political books, among them his *Lettres de Cachet*, a subject with which he should have been thoroughly conversant, for he had been imprisoned and exiled a number of times by means of these secret orders.

Mirabeau recognized the necessity for government and for strong government. He realized that without it the common people could not go on with industry and commerce, but he believed that the people should have a voice in that government. He wanted to secure for the people of France a freedom which would be even greater than that enjoyed by England.

It would have seemed the logical thing for Necker to take the lead at this critical time, but Necker was not a politician. He was a financier. He wanted to adjust the affairs of the nation from a financial standpoint, but he had no understanding of or sympathy for the Social Contract of Rousseau, which was the inspiration for the dreams of the populace.

Louis XVI, while in many ways well meaning and sincere in his desire to see his people happy, was too easily swayed by whoever he came in contact with to be of any use in the plans of the nation. At this time he was apparently willing to grant equal rights to all of his subjects, as well as religious freedom and freedom of the press. As for the people, they had not at this time thought of overthrowing the monarchy.

The National Constituent Assembly had been in session but a fortnight when it was whispered in Paris that the king was planning to crush it with his army. The rumor was true. Some of the nobles who saw the danger of their ancient privileges being swept away, some people say the queen, Marie Antoinette, had incited the king to this rash attempt. Marshal de Broglie was chosen as the instrument. In secret he gathered together the royal troops to surround Paris and Versailles. Necker was to be dismissed and the old order was to be re-established.

On the eleventh of July Necker received his dismissal, which was delivered to him in a sealed letter while he was dining with friends. It was a command to leave France, which he did without saying anything of his plans to his friends. News of his departure reached Paris the next day through a journalist, Camille Desmoulins, who leaped upon a table in the Palais Royal and in an impassioned speech told how Necker had been dismissed. He said that this would be a signal for the king's troops to enter Paris and Versailles and slaughter every patriot. Believing that his words were true, he urged his audience to choose a color which would enable them to recognize each other, and to find arms and defend themselves. The mob chose green and those who did not have a ribbon placed green leaves as cockades in their hats.

On the following day the electors of the city organized a sort of provisional government and formed the first National Guard of France to maintain order and to protect the city. Order was temporarily restored but the revolutionist leaders, inspired by agents of the Duke of Orleans, the king's cousin, known to the Paris populace as Philippe Egalité, were preparing for a greater demonstration than before. The Duke of Orleans, while not in sympathy with the revolutionists or in any way desirous of establishing a democracy, was anxious to create as much trouble as possible for Louis XVI,

for he believed that in this way he could get himself appointed regent of the kingdom.

The mob was in search of arms, which they believed to be concealed in the Hotel des Invalides and in the Bastille. The Bastille was originally built as a castle outside the walls of the city which had grown up around it, and it had become a city prison. During the reign of Louis XIV all sorts of atrocities had been committed there. Men had been imprisoned for no reason at all, in dark, noisome cells, or left to die of starvation. The people still remembered the old stories of cruelty and the Bastille was to them the very symbol of oppression and absolutism.

The mob went to the Hotel des Invalides, where they broke in and secured some arms. They were only partly equipped even now and they hurried on, being joined every moment by fresh insurgents, to the eastern part of the city where the ancient Bastille was located, guarded by the Swiss mercenaries.

To enter the Bastille it was necessary to cross two drawbridges and to find a way over walls ten feet thick and ninety-six feet high. Outside these seemingly insurmountable obstacles the great mob paused to decide how they might capture the ancient prison. They were armed only with muskets, pikes and swords, not very effective weapons for making way through ten-foot walls. Hundreds

of beggars, artisans, and not a few soldiers, had joined the people outside the gate, and while some discussed plans for taking the fortress, others were shouting for admittance or demanding that the governor should come out and confer with them. None of the plans suggested were practicable. They began to send deputations to the gates for conference. At last one man, Thuriot de Larosière, was admitted to speak with the governor, De Launay. Thuriot exacted a promise from De Launay that he would not use his cannon on the mob. He was ready to return to confer with the people outside and the drawbridge covering the moat which separated the people from the outer court of the castle was let down to enable him to pass. Before he could do this the mob began to surge over the bridge, those in front pushed on by those behind, and the Bastille fell.

There were in the mob hundreds of law-abiding citizens, electors of the city and members of the National Guard which they had formed to protect the city, prosperous merchants and honest workmen, but with them were hundreds of others who had known no law since birth, but oppression. Themselves reared on brutality, they knew no other use for their newly acquired power. They had seen hundreds of their companions shot down by the guard and their one thought was to have revenge. The prisoners in the Bastille were freed and the

building torn stone from stone and the moats filled up with the debris. The outline of the old seven-towered castle of oppression may now be seen in the Place Bastille in Paris, marked in the pavement in white stones. A few curios are in the Carnavelet Museum, otherwise it is but a memory.

In spite of needless brutality or perhaps because of it, the people accomplished their purpose. The royalist plot to do away with the Assembly was frustrated. Necker was recalled and the Assembly of Electors was recognized by the king as the government of France. This was the cause of the "first emigration."

The Count D'Artois, Madame Polignac and a large number of other members of the highest nobility of the court, fled from France. They realized that they were no longer safe in a country where a people had at last awakened from their long lethargy, determined to take toll for centuries of oppression in an orgy of unchecked brutality and license. Subsequent events proved the wisdom of their departure. The people had discovered their own power and the fall of the Bastille was only the beginning of the use which they would make of it.

Louis XVI, in addition to recognizing the government of the Assembly of Electors, nationalized or legalized the National Guard and placed Lafayette at its head. He also recognized Bailly, the astronomer, as Mayor of Paris.

Jean Sylvian Bailly was a man of unusual talents. He began by the study of painting, then took up the writing of tragedies, and finally devoted himself to astronomy. He became a member of the French Academy and was noted as an orator. When the States General was convened he was elected a deputy from Paris and made president of the Third Estate. He was now made Mayor of Paris. It is one of the saddest commentaries of the Revolution to watch how this man, as well as dozens of others who served the Revolution so loyally in its beginnings, fell victims to the changing temper of the mob in its later days and paid with their lives for their devotion to the people's cause.

Louis, having acknowledged the new government, the National Guard and the Mayor of Paris, evidenced his bravery by leaving Versailles and going to Paris. Here he was received with honor. Bailly said on his arrival, "Henry IV reconquered his capital, now the capital has reconquered its king," for even then there was no thought of entirely doing away with the monarchy.

In token of his good will, Louis XVI put on a red, white and blue cockade. Red and blue were the colors of the city of Paris, while white was the color of the Bourbons. This was the birth of the tricolor of France, while the taking of the Bastille has been perpetuated in a national holiday on the fourteenth of July.

In spite of the sensible attitude of the king, the months of July and August were months of horror all over France. News of the taking of the Bastille spread over the country and in every town, village and feudal estate the peasants sought to repeat its violence. They rose in mobs and attacked the lords, or if the lords themselves were just, as they often were, they directed their violence against the tax collectors and the customs houses. If the lord delivered up the record of the feudal dues, violence was often averted. The Duke of Orleans was suspected of inciting much of the rioting, still hoping that he could force Louis to abdicate and give him the regency. In the meantime, many of the nobles were forming combines to raise the price of grain, hoping to starve the people into quiet, and thus only augmenting the fury of the mobs. Many other nobles were following the example of the Duke of Artois and the Polignacs by slipping quietly out of Paris and becoming émigrés.

The king could do nothing to quell the riots, for he had no army on which he could depend. Fully half of the soldiers were in sympathy with the people, so the king amused himself by going hunting and ignored as much as possible the condition of his kingdom. As for the Assembly, they were also powerless, even had they wished to do anything. They were occupied with discussing plans for a new government based on the teachings

of the philosophers. They spent weeks discussing words and phrases.

One is prone to think of the Revolution as a period of chaos in which no man's life was safe and in which murder and pillage were the only occupations of the people, but this was not true. There were three phases of life going on in France at this time. There were riots in the big cities. There were frequent peasant uprisings against oppressive landlords, but for the most part life and industry continued as it had before the taking of the Bastille. Farmers still tilled their fields. Inn-keepers and shopkeepers continued their business, and even the banks did not close. The writers, who had been so busy before the Revolution, did not cease and even those whose work was not of a political nature continued to write and publish pamphlets and books and the public continued to read. Art and science were not stopped. Everyday life went on as usual while the mobs rioted, the Assembly discussed Utopian plans of government, and the nobility plotted how to regain their lost power or fled in terror from the country.

We have mentioned how the example of America and the literature of England influenced the Revolution. Now both these countries watched France with deep interest. So far as the English government was concerned, it viewed the disordered state of France with more satisfaction than

alarm. For years France had been the most important country in Europe and so formidable a rival of England that time and again she had been able to checkmate England's plans for conquest. Just at this time France would most certainly have interfered with the plans of England in India if she had not been so occupied with internal troubles that she had time for nothing else.

Among the writers of England another effect was produced. Everywhere people rose who saw in the French Revolution a precedent which they hoped would be followed by all the countries of Europe. These agitators tried to find a parallel in French and English conditions. This was rather difficult, however, as the people of England were for the most part comfortable, prosperous and happy, occupied with internal politics but in no wise hungry for a more democratic government.

The scientist Priestly in England formed a Revolutionary Club and other clubs followed. Many of the clubs wrote letters of congratulation to the French Assembly, praising them on their actions. Altogether there was a vast amount of writing, speech making, meeting of secret societies and agitation of all sorts in England, but there was no deep, underlying dissatisfaction among the people themselves, so it all came to nothing.

A year or so later when the Revolution had progressed farther, Edmund Burke, the great Eng-

lish statesman and political writer, published a work which attracted as much attention from the public as anything written at that time. Burke was at the time unpopular even with his own party. He had written much but he was so independent in thought that he did not realize very greatly from a financial standpoint on any of his work. He had been in sympathy with the American Colonists in their Revolution but had done much to aid England in her conquests in the East. He had been in France a few years earlier and had met Marie Antoinette, as well as many of the French philosophers. He was a sincere admirer of the French queen and he did not fully understand the condition of France. He did not believe that a revolution, begun in violence which looked to him cruel and unnecessary, could have a successful ending.

He published a manifesto entitled *Reflections on the Revolution in France and on the Proceedings of Certain Secret Societies in England Relative to That Event*. Eleven editions of this book were published the first year and at least 30,000 copies were sold before the death of Edmund Burke seven years later. George III of England was delighted with the work, Stanislaus of Poland sent Burke a gold medal and Catherine of Russia sent him her congratulations, though she had been a friend of Voltaire and a benefactress of Diderot. Kings were pleased, but the work increased Burke's

unpopularity with the English House of Commons. Whether or not Burke was mistaken in his denunciations, his former fearless writing and speaking are proof enough that he was sincere.

It was in reply to this book that a book much better known was written, Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*. This book was at this time considered a startling treatise on atheism and has since raised endless controversy, but is not by any means a profound discussion.

Meantime the great writers of France were not idle. Nicolas Chamfort, whose plays and satires had won him a pension and a place in the court, became an ardent republican, forgot his noble friends and entered the Revolution with the greatest enthusiasm. He was for some time secretary of the Jacobin Club, and later a street orator. His writings sound uninteresting to the readers of to-day, with the exception of his *Maxims et Pensées*.

Charles Francois Lebrun had published his *Voix du Citoyen*, in which he told what he thought the probable outcome of the Revolution would be. He was one of the members of the Constituent Assembly and was later to be third consul of France in the Napoleonic era. In fact, literature and politics were so closely interwoven that there is scarcely a name among men of letters of the time that has not also its political history.

We have referred to the secret societies and political clubs formed in the early part of the Revolution. The most important of these societies was that of the Jacobins. It had its beginning in the Breton Club established at Versailles shortly after the opening of the States General. It was at first made up of deputies from Brittany, but later members from other parts of France were admitted. Mirabeau, Robespierre, the Duc d'Aiguillon and other prominent men were among its earliest recruits. The club followed the National Assembly to Paris and took up its quarters in the monastery of the Jacobins, as the Dominican monks in France were called. The term Jacobins was applied to members of the club as a term of ridicule, but later they themselves adopted it.

The first constitution of the club stated that it was organized to discuss plans for the National Assembly, to work for the establishment of the constitution and to correspond with other similar societies throughout France. This work was followed out to such good effect that hundreds of branch clubs were soon affiliated with the original organization. A new president was elected every month and whenever members were convicted of holding views which were too moderate to meet the approval of the others, they were dismissed from the club. The Jacobins became very powerful and formidable. The club contained all sorts of mem-

bers, men of title and such men as "Pere" Michel Gerard, a peasant land proprietor from Brittany whose countryman's waistcoat and plaited hair were later to become the Jacobin style of dress. The term Jacobin finally came to be applied to any person advocating extreme revolutionary principles.

Meantime the Assembly was in session. On the fourth of August, 1789, a committee submitted a report on the state of the nation, recounting the burning of chateaux, the drowning of tax gatherers and the destruction of salt depots, a government monopoly. It was decided that these things were done because the people were not yet assured of the abolition of the feudal dues.

Vicomte de Noailles, a member of the privileged orders, made a motion that all feudal rights be abolished. This motion was seconded by d'Aiguillon, one of the greatest feudal lords in the kingdom. Other lords and the clergy vied with each other in sacrificing wealth and ancient privilege, and finally they voted Louis XVI, "the Restorer of French Liberty," though he was not present and knew nothing of the proceedings.

Meantime the struggle between peasants and lords went on. The National Guard was constantly growing but their efforts to maintain order precipitated fights between guardsmen and peasants which approximated civil war. In towns where the local government was not equal to maintaining

order, municipal committees composed of the bourgeoisie or small trades people were formed.

The abolition of feudal dues did not make the people any less poor or any less ignorant. They found no satisfaction in the action of the court, Assembly, National Guard or municipal committees. They flocked to the meetings of the Jacobin clubs and only in their ultra democratic teachings were they satisfied.

All this time the queen grew more and more difficult and tactless. She refused to make friends with Mirabeau or Lafayette, who might have helped her, and she and other members of the court began plotting. Their plots were discovered and the popular leaders of Paris planned to remove the king from the influence of his court at Versailles and establish him in Paris. This was not easy to accomplish. The manner of Louis's removal brings into prominence one of the most picturesque and terrible figures of the revolution, Marat.

Marat had been the court physician of Count d'Artois. He was a student of light, electricity and other subjects and was a specialist on diseases of the eye. He had written a large number of scientific books, but despite his aristocratic patients was an enthusiastic advocate of the rights of the masses and a bitter enemy of the aristocracy. He established a journal called *L'Ami du Peuple*, which was one of the most extravagant revolutionary papers of the time.

On the first of October the royal body-guard at Versailles gave a supper in honor of the newly arrived soldiers from Flanders. News of the banquet reached Paris and excited the mob, which cried that the court was feasting and drinking while the people starved. They asserted that the red, white and blue cockade had been trampled under foot and that the Royalist song, *Richard My King*, had been sung. Marat went to Versailles a few days later and on his return the plans of the mob, which he is supposed to have inspired, were carried out.

Hundreds of market women and others of the lowest type collected, together with men dressed in women's clothing. They marched first to the city hall of Paris, where they met the National Guard, composed here of members of the old army who were more or less in sympathy with them. When the guards made a weak attempt to fire the women threw themselves at their mercy and asked them if they would fire on women. The soldiers capitulated and then, more because this mob was dangerous in Paris than because there was any real reason for allowing it to leave, it was permitted to march to Versailles, eight miles away. A man named Maillard put himself at their head just as they were about to hang a priest, and led them out of the city with promises of bread in Versailles.

They were naturally worn out after the eight-mile march, but they were readier for riots

than for sleep, or perhaps hunger made them wakeful, for however lawless their actions, their sufferings were very real. They made their way to the Assembly and demanded that the price of bread be lowered by law. They sent a deputation to the king and made their way into the court of the palace before Lafayette, in command of the National Guard, could collect his forces. He succeeded in disposing the mob in churches for the night and then himself retired.

At dawn the mob again made its way into the palace and attempted to break into the queen's apartments. The queen escaped just in time by a private staircase to the apartment of the king. A few hours later the king appeared in public on a balcony. He promised to go to Paris and the crowd cheered wildly. Lafayette then led Marie Antoinette and the dauphin to the king's side. The people protested about the dauphin and he was sent back, but after Lafayette had presented the queen with a tricolor cockade the mob cheered her also.

The return was begun the same day. The king and queen and their children left the great palace of Versailles, built by Louis XIV, to which they never were to return. All along the road to Paris the mob went with them, surrounding the coach and stumbling under the heels of Lafayette's white horse, shouting and cheering and howling the words: "We have got the baker and the baker's

wife and the baker's little boy. Now we shall have bread."

After these events of the fourth and fifth of October, 1789, there followed two years of outward quiet, during which the Assembly formulated the short-lived constitution of 1791.

In these days of quick decisions and actions in national affairs it would seem that this was an unnecessarily long time for the purpose, but it must be remembered that the Assembly was composed of many factions, each with a different idea of what was wanted; and more important than this, there was in France no man who could be looked up to as a great leader with sufficient power or popularity to weld the opposing factions into unity of action.

The deputies were divided into the Extreme Right, the Right, the Center, the Left and the Extreme Left, so called from the various positions in the Assembly hall which they occupied.

Mirabeau, the only man who really knew exactly what he wanted and was clear-sighted enough to see what France actually needed, was not affiliated with any of the five factions. In the first years of the Revolution he was its greatest figure, yet even Mirabeau was not powerful enough to control the destinies of France. For this inability to control the Assembly, his private life was in no small measure responsible. Extravagant, immoral and debauched, in spite of his great oratorical powers, he

was hissed when he made his first appearance in the Assembly, and he could not get Lafayette or any of the other leaders to co-operate with him. He was as much the enemy of anarchy and disorder as he was of privilege, and under happier circumstances might have saved France from the ruin which he saw coming and which he predicted in his great speeches.

The Assembly could not learn from either England or America. Their meetings, conducted by the twelve hundred members, were scenes of wildest disorder. The public was admitted to the galleries and was unrestrained, so that it was only by shouting and theatrical oratory that any man could make himself heard. They were trying to form a new constitution and at the same time to govern the country, a difficult task at best, an impossible task without trusted and responsible leaders.

Instead of waiting until the entire constitution had been completed, as soon as an act was passed it went into effect, which caused endless disorder in the courts of justice and in the administration of taxes. The first measures were the abolishing of all titles, the establishment of the right of free speech, religious freedom and freedom of the press. A procession, dressed in the costumes of different nations, symbolizing the world doing homage to New France; a deputation of children; anything,

would serve to divert the Assembly from its serious tasks.

One of the greatest struggles was over the question of whether the king should have the right of veto. Mirabeau favored this, but the people and the majority of the deputies were opposed to it as making them once more slaves. The people for the most part did not even know the meaning of the word veto, but the Jacobins explained to them that it meant: "You are eating your soup; the king comes along and knocks the bowl from your hands. That is veto." Naturally the people were not in favor of giving the king any such privilege.

Meantime the country had to be governed in some manner. The provinces were abolished and France was divided into eighty-three departments, including Corsica. Each department was divided into nine districts and the districts divided into cantons and the cantons into municipalities. Each department had officers elected by the people, with appropriate judiciary. Each town had charge and control of its own national guard. The unity of France was thus destroyed and every small city was in effect an independent democracy. To make matters worse, the vote was given only to those people who owned enough property to make their taxes equal three days' pay. This did not debar many people, but it developed a certain amount of class hatred.

For many months no taxes had been collected at all. Vast sums had been drawn from the national treasury to establish state workshops, and the government gave great sums of money to the people to buy bread as a free gift. Thousands of people were living on the bounty of the state, making no effort to earn a living.

Necker struggled in vain with the financial problems of the nation. He had as little intelligent co-operation in his efforts to establish a sensible working plan as had Mirabeau in his attempts to establish sane government. The Assembly passed a law making it illegal for any deputy to accept office from the king, thus preventing Mirabeau from becoming a minister, the only position in which he could have hoped to weld together the opposing factions. During the worst period of financial depression, when the great nobles were sending their money to English banks, the Assembly nationalized the royal domain, the personal property of the monarch, and later confiscated the Church property and ordered the sale of \$80,000,000 worth of this Church land.

Mirabeau suggested the issuing of paper money with this land as collateral, and in March, 1790, the Assembly voted the first issue. The government was benefited very little by this plan, which seemed so plausible at first. Speculators in Church lands forced the value of the assignats, as

these paper bonds were called, down ten per cent, and the municipalities, to whom had been entrusted the sale of the Church lands, kept the assignats and sent their own bonds, which were worthless, to the national treasury.

The Assembly which had confiscated the Church property assumed the responsibility of paying the debts of the Church and of pensioning the nuns and monks. The bishops were to be considered the servants of the State. The salaries of curates were increased and those of the higher clergy decreased, in sympathy with the democratic policy of the Assembly.

The clergy were to be elected by their parishioners, thus making the Church democratic and bringing about a complete break with the Church at Rome. Naturally the greater part of the clergy opposed this and in some provinces, where they had been good landlords, the people themselves opposed the action, a petition from one province protesting against the confiscation of Church lands containing names of people of every religious faith.

Most of the clergy refused to take the oath of fealty to the new government. A papal bull denounced the civil constitution of the clergy and good Catholics did not consider the civil clergy as being authorized to perform marriages, christenings or funeral rites. The government, in reply, passed

a law that no bishop or priest who did not take the civil oath should remain in office.

There were uprisings of the people against this law in several provinces, which the National Guard could not cope with effectively, for even this branch of the new government was to some extent disorganized and incompetent. With the entrance of all classes of people into the National Guard, anyone could rise to a commission. The commander-in-chief and the marshals were the only officers who could be appointed by the king. The local Parliaments had been abolished. Judges and juries were elected to the lower and higher courts which were established in each division of the country. It was decided that the legislative body of the nation should have but one house. This made the passage of bills quick and easy, too easy for good government.

Meantime the king watched while his government was reorganized. He dared not leave Paris, for reports of his attempts to follow his nobles out of France were in constant circulation. On the fourth of February, 1790, the king went to the Assembly and made a speech in which he attempted to disperse these suspicions, and followed his speech by publicly taking the civic oath, promising to abide by the new order of things. The whole Assembly rose cheering, and every delegate and the people in the galleries followed the king's

example and took the civic oath pledging themselves to support the new government. All over France the people followed the example set in Paris.

It was decided that the taking of the Bastille should be made a great national holiday. The Champs de Mars was chosen as the scene of the celebration in Paris. Here came thousands of people from all over France. The king, the queen and the little dauphin were present. The king, the deputies and the soldiers stretched out their arms and took the civic oath, while the queen held the dauphin out toward the people in token that the successors of Louis would also abide by it. The people stretched out their arms and repeated the oath. There was enthusiastic cheering at the appearance of the queen holding the dauphin. The same scene was being enacted in hundreds of towns and villages all over France.

The celebration was continued far into the night, and the streets were filled with dancing, singing, shouting people who believed that freedom had at last been achieved, and most of whom, at least among the people of importance, looked to the king with renewed love and loyalty as the rightful leader of the new government.

Mirabeau, seeing the necessity of leadership at this time, urged the king to take active charge of the new government and to place himself at its head in earnest, but his advice went unheeded.

Either Louis XVI was too weak to assume the new responsibilities or else he was insincere and had been only acting a part, hoping that some turn of fortune would restore the old order.

His personal weakness and the bad influence of the queen are usually given as the reasons for his inaction. Mirabeau had come closer to the king than any other member of the Assembly. He urged Louis to assume active charge and to establish himself and the Assembly in some other city than Paris. Mirabeau advised this because the mob concentrated itself in Paris and the mob was dangerous to the king. Anything might start a riot, a street speech, a scarcity of bread, and the lives of the king, queen and dauphin were never safe.

However sincere Louis XVI may have been in his acceptance of the new régime, the queen was not satisfied with it, and she used her influence to prevent the king doing anything which would strengthen his union with the Assembly. Lafayette, too, opposed the plans of Mirabeau, partly through jealousy, partly through lack of vision. Necker, convinced of the hopelessness of his task, resigned in September, 1790, and retired to Switzerland.

As the second year of the Assembly drew to a close it became evident that it had not been strong enough to accomplish its purpose and that the first Revolution was to be followed by another

of a more violent nature. The Extreme Left was rapidly moulding public opinion along the most radical lines. The Extreme Left was composed of the followers of Rousseau, who to a great extent belonged to the Jacobin Club. A minority in the Assembly, yet they exercised a tremendous influence through the Jacobins.

Clubs had been formed all over France, affiliated with the central club at Paris. At first these clubs contained many members of the bourgeoisie, well-to-do people bent on maintaining law and order and protecting life and property. As the Jacobins grew more radical in their teachings, advocating the complete abolition of the monarchy and an increase in the number of public workshops, which were already a great drain on the national treasury, the more conservative people withdrew and the leaders of the clubs became young lawyers or journalists who inflamed the people to still greater demands by their speeches and writings.

The proceedings of all of the clubs were made public through the medium of many new newspapers which had sprung up in the last two years, bloodthirsty sheets such as that of Marat. The hatred of the masses, which had at first been directed only at the nobles, was now directed at the bourgeois class also. Anyone who owned property or was prosperous was an enemy. Meantime the nobles, those who remained in France and those

who had taken refuge in other countries as well, were constantly plotting to bring back the old order. Some of them formed a Monarchial or Royalist Club and sought to buy off the masses by giving them free food, but this club was suppressed almost as soon as formed.

The Cordelier Club, which also took its name from a monastery where its meetings were held, was almost as powerful in Paris as that of the Jacobins. This club had Danton, Marat, Camille Desmoulins and other pronounced radicals among its members, men bent on destroying the monarchy as well as other institutions of the old régime.

The ordinary people had been content after the formation of the Assembly to let the government take care of itself. They considered their cause as won, and for this reason the greater number of the more conservative people did not take the trouble to vote. This left the elections in the hands of the members of the Jacobin and Cordelier Clubs and similar organizations, for these two were not the only radical clubs in France.

The government, represented in the Assembly and the National Guard, succeeded in maintaining some sort of order in Paris, but throughout the departments of the country there was constant strife between the mobs and the orderly bourgeoisie class. The formation of a royalist club was the signal for a riot. People were sometimes lynched

by mobs because they were suspected of being aristocrats.

When Louis XVI made formal acceptance of the constitution, he wrote letters to the rulers of all the European countries informing them of his step, and the countries which had been watching affairs in France naturally concluded that this was the end of the Revolution.

There had been some talk of intervention by foreign powers in the affairs of France. Catherine of Russia was sincerely interested in the queen of France and sympathetic about her troubles. Catherine tried to interest the other European powers in an intervention, of which she would herself have stood clear, thus occupying the other powers to such an extent that she could carry out unmolested her own plans for the advancement of Russia.

Marie Antoinette was constantly hoping for such foreign assistance also, feeling that she had less to fear from foreign foes than from her adopted people. But after the public acceptance of the constitution by the king and queen, the foreign powers lost interest and there was no longer either hope or fear of such a development.

It must not be thought that all the people of France were occupied with speeches, radical newspapers or riots. We have told how the daily work went on and the amusements of the people

continued. Yet everything was colored by the new ideals of life and government.

The craze for simplicity and the natural, started by the philosophies of Rousseau, was carried into the art of David, whom Louis XVI had made court painter. David's paintings possessed a severe classicism which was copied in every other branch of art. The people themselves tried to dress and live after the fashion of the people of the Roman Republic.

David became an ardent enthusiast for the new republic at the outbreak of the Revolution. He painted a picture of the Oath of the Tennis Court, and with the sketch of this painting as a proof of his republican sympathies, he succeeded in being elected to the convention of 1792 from the Section de Museum. Here he was later to cast a vote for the destruction of the French Academy at Rome and for the death of the king, the two influences which had meant the most in building his own success, for it was in the Academy of Rome that he first gained recognition, and Louis XVI had been his generous patron.

His painting, *Brutus Condemning His Sons*, no doubt illustrates his own sacrifice of his patron to his principles. When Napoleon rose to power, David became his enthusiastic admirer, and his picture, *The Coronation of Josephine at Notre Dame*, is his best known painting. The cold sever-

ity of his work is such that his pictures, in spite of their perfection of detail, do not have a very great appeal for art lovers of today. The classical subjects are especially lacking in warmth. His portraits are more pleasing.

Another painter whose work is closely identified with the court of Louis XVI and with the Revolutionary period was Madame Marie Anne Elizabeth Vigée LeBrun, 1755-1842. The daughter of a painter, she received her first instructions from her father, though her work received greater influence from Greuze, and other masters of the period whom she met in Paris. She married J. P. B. LeBrun, also a painter and art critic, in 1776, but her reputation was established long before this time. Her picture, *Peace Bringing Back Abundance*, gained her admittance to the French Academy in 1783. She is best known as a portrait painter, six hundred and fifty portraits being credited to her brush, as well as two hundred landscapes and fifteen historical pictures.

She was a great favorite in society and was in especial favor with the queen, Marie Antoinette, of whom she painted over twenty portraits. Her treatment of women and children was especially sympathetic and pleasing. At the outbreak of the Revolution she went to Italy and painted in both Rome and Naples. Later she went to Vienna, Berlin, St. Petersburg and London. In the last city

she painted Lord Byron and the Prince of Wales. She also lived in Switzerland for a time. Wherever she went she achieved popularity and left souvenirs of her genius. She returned at last to Paris, where she died. She wrote a book of memoirs called *Souvenirs*, in which a detailed account of her life may be read.

Jean Baptiste Greuze, 1725-1805, was at the same time attempting to put Rousseau's theories of a return to nature and simplicity on canvas, and was working also as a historical painter. He put into his work the drama of everyday, pictures of home life, such as we associate with the Dutch masters, but done in a very different style. The simplicity of the Dutch interiors is genuine, those of this French painter were artificial. However, he succeeded in putting on canvas the domestic drama which Diderot had not been able to make popular on the stage.

Pierre Paul Prud'hon, 1758-1823, also belongs to this period in art. He painted classic allegorical subjects: Truth and Wisdom, a ceiling decoration; Diana and Jupiter, for the gallery of antiquities of the Louvre; Crime Punished by Vengeance and Justice, and Psyche Carried Off by Zephyrs. These last two paintings were perpetuated by two of the most prominent engravers of the time, the first by Royer, the second by Massard.

All through the Revolution and the Napoleonic period there was no break in the art life of France. Antoine Jean Gros, 1773-1835, was the father of Romanticism in painting. He was a pupil of David and in 1791 was occupied in painting the portraits of the members of the Convention. As a follower of Napoleon he painted numbers of historical pictures, and was appointed member of the commission which decided which of the spoils of war should be added to the treasures of the Louvre. When David quitted Paris it was Gros who took his classes, and to these he added many new pupils of his own, so that his influence extended far beyond his own life or country.

Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres, 1780-1867, was another famous pupil of David. From David he acquired a purity of line and literacy of rendition which was in strange contrast to the unusual color combinations in which he seemed to delight. This was perhaps the result of a struggle between his own personality and the teachings of the master, David, whose work and ideals he revered. His *Girl After Bathing*, *Portrait of the First Consul*, and *Portrait of the Emperor*, the best known of his pictures, were executed in Paris during the period when the Academy had been suspended because of the unsettled state of affairs in France. His later work includes many pictures of the Romantic school established by Gros. The *Betrothal of*

Raphael, Don Pedro of Toledo Kissing the Sword of Henry IV, Envoy of Charles V, and the Death of Leonardo, are among these. He also painted many religious pictures. His work shows always a struggle between the new romanticists and the classic severity which he learned from David.

In the year of the first constitution, 1791, Jean Louis André Théodore Géricault, founder of the French realist school, was born. His paintings were almost all subjects in which horses were painted in action with wonderful naturalness and sympathy, but his most notable single picture is the Raft of the Medusa, which was the most extreme in its reaction from the classic severity of David. His contributions to art were few because of his early death, which occurred in 1824 when he was only thirty-three years old.

Great progress was also made in the drama during the Revolution, not so much in the plays themselves as in the matter of costuming and scenery. Shakespeare's plays had become popular in France, but the actors and actresses had always appeared in the ordinary costumes of their time. While the Assembly was in session, the great French actor, Francois Joseph Talma, was thrilling his audiences with his new exposition of realism in acting. David and Talma were friends, and David is credited with being the first to suggest that the small part of Proculus in Voltaire's Brutus be per-

formed in the old Roman costume, which was the beginning of the custom of appearing upon the stage in the costume of the period represented.

Among the friends of Talma were Danton, Desmoulins, Joseph Chénier and other Revolutionary writers. On November 4, 1789, a play called Charles IX, written by Chénier, was produced in in the Comédie Francais, with Talma in the leading role. The play was of an anti-monarchial nature, and when Talma spoke a couplet prophetic of the fall of the Bastille the whole house burst into wild enthusiasm, led by Mirabeau. This incident led to political dissensions in the theater, and Talma himself established a new theater known at the time as the Théâtre de la Republique. The present Théâtre Francaise is on the same site. Here Talma won his greatest triumphs, amusing the people of Paris straight through the revolutionary period and living to become as great a favorite with Napoleon as he had been with Mirabeau.

Literature was also progressing. If much of the people's time was being taken up with sensational journalism, the writers of memoires, that peculiarly French method of literary expression, were also busy. The art of the novel was still practically unknown in France, though it had been born in England. Great literature is seldom brought out in any country during a transition period, and it was so in France. But if there were no masters in lit-

erature, there were many writers of interest to their own time, and interesting to modern readers because they throw strong light on the period in which they lived.

Madame de Stael, one of the earliest of the French novelists, belongs to this class of writers. She was the daughter of Necker, the financier, and her mother had been famous for her salon in Paris, where the French philosophers met to discuss their ideas and their plans for the rebuilding of France. Madame Necker was beautiful, but of the languid type then most popular. Her daughter, Ann Louise, afterward Madame de Stael, was not beautiful, but she possessed remarkable eyes and a robust constitution and was famed for her wonderful gift as a conversationalist.

At this time sentimentality was the correct thing among people of fashion. Women kissed on meeting and parting, though they were the most casual friends, and every event, however simple, was supposed to excite tears or extravagant joy. From this it may be guessed that at least a part of Madame de Stael's fame as a conversationalist came from an ability to act.

She began writing when only fifteen. When her father first resigned she went with him to Switzerland, where a quiet life restored health which had been impaired by too much excitement and over-study. In 1785 they returned to Paris and

Mlle. Necker resumed her literary work. She wrote a novel, *Sophie*, published in 1786, and another, *Jeanne Gray*, was published in 1790 in the very midst of the Revolutionary period. It was, however, necessary for her to marry in spite of the fact that she was both rich and talented, for at that time all women were supposed to marry. It was their one destiny.

Mlle. Necker was not beautiful, and her personality, which afterward gave her such charm for men, was not fully developed. She had many admirers in spite of her plainness, and finally married the Baron of Stael-Holstein, first attaché of the Swedish legation and afterward minister. When her father resigned from the States General she was enabled to remain in Paris through her position as an ambassadress. Afterward she fled to England for a short time, returning to become a prominent figure in the society of the Directory. Her political importance belongs to the Napoleonic period. She appears now only as an example of how literary work went on and novels and plays were produced during the period of disorganization in France.

Ponce Denis Lebrun, the poet of the Revolution, was also writing at this time, and adding his note to the Terror by poems directed against the king and queen.

Chateaubriand, who was the greatest literary man of the time, had fled with the Emigrés

to England and was not to return to France until the days of the first Empire. He was in sympathy with the Revolution in its earliest stages, but he disapproved of the anarchistic and lawless methods of its later development. In addition, he belonged to the hated nobility, and it was the part of wisdom to go to England, where he could live and write in safety.

Mirabeau died in 1791, and in spite of the fact that he was at variance with almost every man in France, he was buried with great pomp in the Pantheon, where less than three years later his body was disinterred to make room for that of Marat. His death removed the greatest source of restraint from the Extreme Left of the Assembly, and hatred of royalty and suspicion of the king and queen grew accordingly. It was shortly after this that the king and queen made an attempt to escape from Paris.

A few months later Louis accepted the constitution, but he had lost the confidence of the people by his attempted flight, and hatred of the monarchy was constantly growing. One of its greatest enemies was Danton, a man who in some ways filled the place as leader left vacant by the death of Mirabeau. At a meeting of the Cordelier Club, Danton proposed that Louis be tried and removed from office. The plan was approved by both the Jacobins and Cordeliers, and a petition

was drawn up and placed on the great altar of the Champs de Mars for signatures.

The first Legislative Assembly, which met in October, 1791, was quite different from the Constituent Assembly which had made the constitution. Upon a motion of Robespierre, the Constituent Assembly had very generously, if unwisely, decided that none of its members should be elected to the succeeding house. Therefore the Legislative Assembly was as inexperienced, as ignorant of legislation or statesmanship, as the first body had been. In the elections the extreme radicals had won over their opponents almost universally, partly because many of the conservative element made no attempt to vote and many of those who did were stabbed or stoned away from the ballot boxes. The Jacobin Club even burned one of the ballot boxes where the conservatives had a majority.

The new Assembly was as disunited as the one before it. There were the Feuillants or Constitutionalists; the Mountain, so called because of the high seats which they occupied; and most important of all, the Girondins. This party was so named because their leaders came from the department of the Gironde in the southwestern part of France.

The Girondins have been variously described by historians as a body of pure-minded patriots who suffered martyrdom for their country,

and as a body of hot-headed young lawyers who did not know what they wanted and lacked statesmanship to get it even if they knew. The truth lies somewhere between these two extremes.

Among the wild scenes which they propounded was one to establish a republic by the aid of foreign countries. It was even proposed to cede Dunkirk and Calais to England as surety that any treaty with that country would be carried out. Yet their leaders included Danton and Robespierre as well as Marat, who had seen his printing establishment destroyed by the National Guard and was more bitter than ever against the aristocrats.

Georges Jacques Danton was a great orator, the greatest since Mirabeau, but he did not share the conservative ideals of Mirabeau, and therefore found it much easier to get a following.

Maximilien Robespierre was a young lawyer, a disciple of Rousseau and something of a writer. His great strength lay in his absolute sincerity. He could not be corrupted and he would not deviate from what he thought was right, even to please the mob.

The advanced revolutionary spirit of the Jacobins and Cordeliers became the ruling spirit of France. During the last two years the court had made an effort to maintain the old life and the formal etiquette of the old régime, but one of the first acts of the Legislative Assembly was to abolish

the titles of Sire and Your Majesty as terms of address for the king, and on the first of January, 1792, the new Mayor of Paris did not make the customary call on the king. This was the spirit of democracy that before another year was to abolish even the titles of Monsieur and Madame. All people were to be addressed as "Citizen" and "Citizeness," regardless of previous rank or present wealth.

There was not only a growing sentiment against the monarchy, but a growing confidence in the ability of the people to establish a republic. Louis chose this inauspicious time for using his power of veto. The Assembly had passed two bills, one stating that all priests who would not take the oath of allegiance of the Assembly must leave France within a month, the other a bill providing for a camp of twenty thousand soldiers outside Paris to protect the city. Robespierre opposed both these bills, the first because it was unnecessarily rigid and the second because it would be dangerous to the maintenance of peace within the country itself, and the king vetoed both. This aroused the suspicion of the Assembly, as it seemed to indicate that the king was expecting outside aid.

No one doubted that the king was in league with their enemies. Subordinate leaders, unaided by either Robespierre or Danton, decided on a popular demonstration to force the king to retract. It took the form of a great procession

which marched to the Assembly hall. The plan was to present a petition to the Assembly and to plant a liberty tree in honor of the Oath of the Tennis Court. They came, bearing banners made of the hated short trousers, but the procession, which started out in orderly fashion, soon became a howling mob. They invaded the Palace of the Tuileries crying, "Down with Monsieur Veto."

The king and queen both presented themselves at windows, wearing red caps, and the people were soon cheering them with the quickly changing sentiment which characterized them throughout the Revolution. A young deputy wept with sympathy for the queen after the mob had left the palace. "I weep, Madame, for the misfortunes of a beautiful and sensitive woman, and for the sufferings of a mother," he said. "I do not weep for the queen. I hate kings and queens; it is my religion." This was the religion of all France. They were no more devoted to reason than they were to Christianity, but were intoxicated with their dreams of liberty.

In the summer of 1792 the Duke of Brunswick, commander of the forces united against France, issued a proclamation which made doubt certainty. He declared that Austria and Prussia were invading France for the protection of the king and queen; that members of the National Guard fighting against them would be banished

as rebels; that if Louis and Marie Antoinette were not assured their liberty, or if the least violence was offered to the Tuileries, Paris would be put under martial law by the invaders.

All liberal factions joined in accepting the challenge. The height of the Revolutionary spirit had died down in Paris, but the foreign danger again roused it and at the same time a little band of some five hundred National Guardsmen started from Marseilles to march to Paris with the avowed intention of reawakening the Revolution.

This was the occasion of the adoption of the national anthem of France. The song was written by Joseph Rouget de Lisle, a French soldier quartered at Strassburg, in April, 1792. He called the song "The War Chant of the Army of the Rhine," but from the time of the fateful march of the Marseilles Battalion it was known as the *Marseillaise*, and has become the hymn of revolution and protest for all the world.

The Marseilles Battalion came into Paris on July 30, singing their hymn, and on hearing it the crowds went wild. Before its arrival the Assembly had appointed a committee to draw up a list of acts of the king which would justify his dethronement and the Jacobins had organized every department of Paris. The National Guard had been carefully inspected and every man who could not be trusted to aid the Revolution was taken out and

replaced by an ardent Republican. The drift of things for a long time past had been toward republicanism. The monarchy was now doomed.

The plan of the Assembly committee was to involve the defenders of the king in a fight with the mob, after which Louis could be accused of treason for countenancing their use of arms against the Republic. All Paris knew of the plot, and before dawn of August 10 a crowd had already gathered outside the Tuileries. They were quite orderly at first, but as their number increased they became more noisy, waiting impatiently for developments.

The king was at last convinced of his danger, and was persuaded to leave the palace. Accompanied by members of the royal family, he walked unnoticed through the streets of Paris to the Assembly hall. Here he was courteously received and placed in a small room, a sort of reporters' box behind the president's chair, where he was to remain imprisoned from the mob for thirty hours, and where his healthy appetite for his meals and his seeming indifference to what was going on about him greatly embarrassed Marie Antoinette.

The crowd had in the meantime forced its way into the courtyard of the palace and, led by the Marseilles Battalion, had attacked its guard. There followed one of the most pitiful tragedies of all that tragic time. Louis, from his refuge in the Assembly hall, sent an order to the Guard to cease firing,

which did not reach its destination until too late. The mob, maddened by the resistance and bloodshed, massacred not only the defenders of the palace, but the attendants and servants as well, and burnt part of the building.

The Assembly had not intended the demonstration to take this form, many members sincerely regretted the bloodshed; but, after all, their work was to establish a republic, no matter what means were used to achieve their ends. They proceeded to suspend Louis from office. From now on until the actual establishment of the Republic the real ruler of France was the Paris Commune or Town Council. These men, representing the masses and the clubs and supported by the Jacobin minority in the Assembly, were a power that had grown too great to be checked by reason or justice. Among their members were the most radical and desperate leaders in France. Through this Commune the masses sought to take control of the Republic away from the Girondins, who no longer represented the most radical element.

Three days after the suspension of Louis from office, the Assembly met to draw up a new constitution for France. A provisional Executive Council was appointed. In the Assembly the Girondins were still in the lead numerically and Roland was made head of the interior government, Servan of war and Danton of justice. These men were all

Girondins, theorists who desired to repeat in France the glories of the Roman Republic.

The struggle in France against the monarchy was now practically finished, but instead of the internal peace which had been hoped for, a new struggle was begun between the Girondins and the Paris Commune, which was represented by the Jacobin minority in the Assembly. Both of these factions were fighting for control of the government. Their tangible differences of opinion were easily defined. The Commune desired a strongly centralized government with the balance of power located in Paris. The Girondins thought this idea undemocratic; they believed that the power should be equally distributed throughout the provinces.

This plan, according to the Commune, would destroy united France and make it little more than a group of independent states. The Commune also believed that only by the harshest methods of dealing with royalist sympathizers could this safety of the new Republic be insured. The Girondins believed in milder methods. One thing above all others worked to make the Jacobins and the Commune the successful party in the struggle. They were men of action with direct ideas which could be carried out. The Girondins were altruistic dreamers who could make speeches, but whose plans for the regeneration of France were either too vague or too ideal.

There was need for the Assembly to act quickly, for the country was endangered both from within and from without. The Royalist sympathizers were not idle. Lafayette had tried to win his soldiers to take arms for the king, and failing in this, he fled to the Austrians, where, because he was no more an ardent royalist than he was a radical republican, he was imprisoned.

There was disorder everywhere. In the department of the Vendée the peasants were in revolt because of the laws against their priests, whom they loved. The French armies had been meeting defeat, and the Duke of Brunswick was only three days' march from Paris. The city was full of Royalist sympathizers, who were constantly plotting and who would welcome the Prussian invasion. These things made the Commune very anxious to dispose of Louis XVI at once.

In the beginning of the Revolution the most radical leaders of France had only desired to secure a constitutional in place of an absolute monarchy. Louis at almost any time, if he had shown himself a strong man, could have taken up the reins of government and saved both his throne and his life, but in every crisis he had displayed vacillation or weakness. The unwise actions of the queen, which had increased the people's natural dislike for her as an Austrian, and the attempt of the king and queen to escape from Paris and join the emigres,

had changed the entire sentiment of the people for their king. He was no longer possible in any capacity, and so long as he lived there was always danger that the Royalists would attempt to reinstate him. The Girondins would still have liked to save his life, but the Commune believed that his death was a political necessity.

The Assembly established a tribunal to try the conspirators of the tenth of August, including the surviving members of the guard and the few nobles who had assisted in the defense of the Tuileries. On the day following the establishment of this tribunal, August 30th, Danton made and the Assembly carried a motion to institute a search of all of the houses of Paris for arms. A committee in charge of Marat was chosen for this work. The gates of the city were closed and the streets were filled with the National Guard. Every house was entered and searched thoroughly. If any man resented the invasion of his home and refused to open the doors, they were summarily beaten down. Three thousand people suspected of being Royalist sympathizers were arrested. The prisons were not large enough to hold them, and some were imprisoned in convents and public halls. The Assembly did not approve of this drastic action and ordered the Commune to disband. Robespierre used his influence to bring this about, but instead of disbanding they increased their number.

At the same time Danton made a powerful plea for more volunteers and more courage to withstand the foreign invaders. The response was generous, but it led to the real beginning of the Reign of Terror which was to last two years. No leader had risen to unite the warring factions of France, a common enemy had failed to weld them together. Now the Commune decided that what could not be accomplished either through patriotism or love of liberty should be brought about through fear.

"Can we leave Paris," the volunteers asked, "while three thousand traitors remain here endangering the lives of our wives and children?" They seemed to forget that the traitors were unarmed and in prison. So the prisoners were put to death after a mere semblance of trial.

During those first days of September, 1792, over one thousand people of every rank were executed in Paris alone. Similar legal murders were committed all over France. Yet if we judge this as the brutality of the masses and call it mob rule, we must in justice remember that these people had learned their lesson in callousness and cruelty through centuries of persecution from the ruling classes. For years they had been starved, not only physically but mentally. Even to speak or write independent thoughts had meant death, only fifty years before this time. In a few short years they had learned license, but had not yet mastered the

lesson that true freedom implies both tolerance and self control; that liberty is founded on discipline.

The Assembly was in complete submission to the Commune, and the Commune represented the will of the people, a people as narrow in their conception of freedom as the Church had been in its control, or the kings had been in their complete faith in their divine rights.

Royalists and the nobility were either driven from the country or searched out and executed. Circulars were issued urging all loyal Frenchmen to rid the country of the dangerous aristocrats and traitors before the arrival of the foreign foe. If any excuse can be found for all these murders it is in the fact that the object of the Commune was accomplished and a counter revolution against the new régime was prevented through the terror. Soon after this the advance of the Prussians was stopped and Paris forgot the massacres in renewed gaiety, theaters and cafés were open and well patronized, and peace reigned.

On January 21, 1793, "Citizen Louis Capet, one time King of France," was executed on the guillotine. There is little doubt now that his execution was justified on grounds of treason, but the evidence brought out at the time was hardly sufficient to have convicted him in fair trial.

The guillotine has since that time stood for all that is terrible and cruel, and it is curious to

reflect that it was invented as a humanitarian measure. In the first place, Dr. Guillotin did not invent it, as has often been stated. He was, however, responsible for the reformatory law which made its invention necessary. Previous to the Revolution, even under Louis XVI, criminals were tortured before death and only the nobility were given the grace of instantaneous death by the executioner. Guillotin was a doctor belonging to the Third Estate, who was made one of the delegates to the first Constituent Assembly. He proposed that a law be passed abolishing all forms of torture and granting to all criminals, of whatever class, the same justice. Those condemned to death were to be killed instantly. The law was a great step in civilization, for the people of France had become so accustomed to torture that such things were witnessed by all classes with very little feeling of pity or horror.

The law was passed and it now became necessary to devise some method for carrying it out. Dr. Antoine Louis was then perpetual secretary to the French Academy of Surgery, and in this capacity he was charged by the Assembly to invent a machine for bringing instantaneous death to criminals. The result was the guillotine which he designed. It was first called La Louissette, but the people soon changed the name to the guillotine, in honor of the man who had passed the humane

law, little guessing that it would one day be more of a reproach than an honor.

After the tenth of August a great change might have been seen in the streets of Paris. No longer were there any Royalist decorations. Shopkeepers, anxious not to lose trade by having signs out of sympathy with the new régime, employed painters to efface the fleur-de-lys, the Bourbon emblem, and to paint in its place the tricolor. The bourgeois class had in the early stages of the Revolution taken power away from the nobility. Now the working class, represented by the clubs and the Commune of Paris, were ruling both the nobles and the bourgeoisie. Throughout there were thousands of people who took no active part in any of the swift changes, but were content to go quietly about their work or business, bending to whatever class was in power, regardless of personal beliefs.

Upon a motion made by Carnot the National Guard had opened its ranks to any man who wanted to join, regardless of every distinction. Napoleon Bonaparte had already distinguished himself as a member of the French army, but it is doubtful if even he could have risen to his great power if democracy in military affairs had not thus been established through the Revolution.

All restrictions on the ballot were now done away with; property considerations were abolished and every citizen who had reached the age

of twenty-five could vote. Thus the ballot and the military were all in the hands of the radical Republicans.

The dress of the people was changed. Previous to the establishment of the Republic the nobles and richer bourgeois classes had worn stockings and knee breeches and only the common laborers and peasants had worn long trousers. Now everyone must express his Republicanism by wearing the dress of the ruling class, the common people. The expression "sans culottes" or "without short breeches" became a term of designation for all good Republicans. Only Robespierre dared to wear silk stockings and knee breeches and go without the red cap of the working man. His hair was as carefully powdered and his cue as neatly tied with ribbon, as ever.

Even the calendar of the Old Régime could not be tolerated. September 1st was made the beginning of the year, for time only began for the loyal Frenchman when the Republic was established. The months were renamed and divided into three weeks of ten days each, every tenth day being for rest. These holidays were called sans-culottides.

The Girondins had a scheme in keeping with their Roman Republic ideals, for having all the children educated by the State. They were to be taught to read by the Declaration of Rights,

and a part of their time was to be spent on state owned farms, learning agriculture.

Journalism still flourished. Marat, whose presses had been destroyed by Lafayette, petitioned the Assembly to give him the royal presses which had belonged to Louis XVI. The Assembly refused, but the Commune granted his request, thus showing where the real power was vested. So newspapers were printed, theaters kept open, people went to balls and danced, worked, ate and slept as usual; and to many, the only difference which the new régime made was in the fact that they had to obey the last act of the Legislative Assembly, which compelled every citizen, both men and women, to obtain from the municipal authorities a card of identification, showing name, residence and occupation, which must be produced at any time on demand from either a police officer or a suspicious fellow citizen. Failure to show the card meant arrest and possible death.

As for the exiled nobles, the émigrés, those who were not fighting in the Prussian army against their own countrymen, were living abroad on the pensions given them by foreign sympathizers. Philippe, Duke of Orleans, whose son was one day to occupy the throne of France, remained in Paris and became a member of the Convention of 1793. He was elected under the name of Philippe Egalité. He did not choose the name himself but some

members of the convention objected to the name Orleans and he asked them to suggest another. Egalité was suggested and he was so called.

With him in the convention was David the painter. There were other aristocrats who remained in France and escaped exile and death by avowing the principles of Republicanism and by sending their sons into the Republican army. This was considered sufficient evidence of good faith and they were left unharmed.

The plans for the government of France were far in advance of anything which the world had ever conceived before. In addition to the ideas for the education of boys and girls by the State, pensions were proposed for aged workingmen, the maintenance of the poor, the support of poor widows, pensioning of maimed soldiers, the abolishing of slavery, closing of the stock exchange and the prohibition of speculation in the necessities of life, a far reaching and altruistic program which centuries of development have not seen fully carried out in any country in the world.

Especially was the Assembly interested in the education of the masses. Danton said: "When you sow the vast field of the republic, do not, I beg you, count the cost of the seed. Next after bread, education is the first necessity of the life of the people." This statement, which any one of us today will admit as being true, was radical in the ex-

treme at that time. Robespierre held the same opinions. He believed in compulsory education and that useful trades should be taught, as well as letters.

The leaders were not satisfied with any democracy which the world had at that time brought forth. They said that the democracy of England was for the upper classes, that the new republic in America was for the well-to-do, but in France it should be for the people.

The struggle between the Girondins and Jacobins was not yet over; personal ambition ran high and the latter succeeded in having a number of the Girondins arrested, among them Madame Roland. Shortly after this Marat was assassinated and thus became a martyr in the eyes of his followers, and the cause of the Jacobins and the Commune was practically won. Danton was able to carry out his plans for centralizing the power of France, organizing her resources and preparing for her defense.

It was Danton who proposed the law forbidding imprisonment for debt, a practice which still obtained in both England and America. The French coast being in a state of blockade, no food could come in from the outside and the country must live upon its own resources. The law of maximum, a limit to prices at which food could be sold, spoiled the graft of the speculators and insured equal prices to all the people. At the same

time the stock exchange was closed. The proposed law making husbands and wives joint owners of property was also passed, and the laws establishing public schools, all this during the time that has gone down in history as the Reign of Terror. Laws were also passed giving pensions to old soldiers and workingmen, as well as the widows' pension law, making it operative for unmarried mothers as well as widows. These had the right to enter the public hospitals and were even given an allowance for clothing their babies.

Gradually the members of the Committee for Public Safety became a dictatorship of twelve men, called the Great Committee. In this Danton refused to serve, foreseeing the trend of affairs away from Republicanism, and his leadership was taken by Robespierre. This Great Committee named and dominated all the other committees of the Convention. All France was held in check by fear. The suspicion of being a Royalist sympathizer might fall on any man or woman, and suspicion might be quickly followed by death. No one felt safe and therefore people were glad to live as unobtrusively as possible and do whatever the Great Committee ordered. The new government was strong and ably managed. No one dared attack it. There were no more mobs. The men whom the Great Committee told to go to war went; those who were instructed to till the fields, tilled them;

no one dared to buy or sell except at the prices fixed by law. Idle men were sent to the army or to the farms to provide food for the nation. The mobs of market women who had once thronged the Assembly hall were now busy knitting.

Marie Antoinette was still imprisoned in the Temple, as the old fortress of the Knights Templar was called. Her spirit was crushed, her beauty gone, her hair turned white and her sight failing, yet it is stated that she was not unkindly treated. But she had no place in the new régime and on October 14th, 1793, she was brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal and was condemned to death. Madame Roland and many of the Girondins met death in the same way, but now there was no revolt.

All this time France as a nation had no religion. The great mass of people still adhered to the Christian faith as represented by the Catholic Church, but there was no official recognition of this. Hébert, a publisher who followed in the footsteps of Marat and who was a member of the Great Committee, was one of the most bitter enemies of everything clerical. His followers burlesqued the ceremonies of the Church, put priestly vestments on donkeys, chanted songs of liberty in cathedrals. Golden vessels formerly used for sacred service were confiscated and made into money. Church bells were melted and cast into cannon.

The more conservative members of the Convention did not look on these things with favor. A reaction was coming which would do away with much of the prevalent atheism as well as the wholesale slaughter of the guillotine. Camille Desmoulins and Danton had started a paper called *The Old Cordelier*, in which more clemency was urged. Both these men fell under suspicion of being enemies of the government and Danton died on the guillotine, but Robespierre remained and it was he who made the first public fight for a re-establishment of religion. He had no belief in the doctrines of the Church but he did believe in a Supreme Being, and so he set himself against the Hébertists and put them down in a series of great speeches. He asserted that atheism was degrading, but that it was something much worse than that, it was aristocratic. He did not try to set up any priesthood or any dogma. He simply persuaded the Convention to issue a statement saying: "We do not believe in paganism; we do not believe that death is an eternal sleep; we believe that God reigns and that the soul will never die." And a festival in honor of the Supreme Being was celebrated in Paris, and similar celebrations were held throughout the provinces.

Robespierre, like most of the members of the Great Committee, was absolutely disinterested so far as money was concerned. All of the mem-

bers were poor and most of them lived very simply, but their agents were not so unselfish. Robespierre's honest policy thwarted their designs for making money out of the Revolution and they began to circulate reports that he was ambitious for a dictatorship. In those days, when no man could be certain that he would not be accused and condemned at any moment on any pretext, the report was easily believed. Fears, suspicions and lies soon combined to bring about the arrest of Robespierre and he died on the guillotine, July 28th, 1794, as had Danton before him.

Shortly after this, the reaction to the Terror set in. Prison doors were opened, the death carts ceased to rumble over the rough pavements of Paris, bearing the condemned to the guillotine, and instead of the old bloody tribunal, the Committee of Clemency suggested by the journalist, Camille Desmoulins, came into being. The crowds were tired of slaughter. The enemies of Robespierre found that his death did not bring them into power.

The prosperous middle class people of France, for there was prosperity for some even during the Terror, wanted peace. They did not want a return to monarchy, nor were they any more desirous of seeing a continuance of the Terror. They wanted to enjoy the fruits of the Revolution, the benefits that had been promised.

They favored men who were moderate and practical. Gradually changes were made in the committees and such moderate men replaced the radical Jacobins.

After the doors of the Jacobin Club were closed by order of the Convention, milder laws were put into effect. The liberty of the press, which had been denied during the Terror, was again resumed and the law against nobles and priests withdrawn. This was a mistake, for the nobles and the clergy came flocking back to France and immediately began intriguing for the re-establishment of the monarchy. The harvest of 1794 was bad and the poorer people, still imbued with the communistic principles of Marat, were again shouting for bread. They believed that the Revolution should have abolished poverty and they had no sympathy for returned priests or nobles. The Terror had worn itself out but order had not yet come.

The newly won successes of the Republican armies made all thought of restoring the monarchy by foreign intervention hopeless, so the royalists must work from within; to this end they bought up newspapers and tried to stir up dissension among the people through the medium of the press. Even in the country districts papers were passed from hand to hand and were eagerly read by all the peasants who possessed the necessary education.

Those who could not read gathered at the homes of those who could, or met in inns and listened to the reading by their better educated neighbors.

The Revolution had done many cruel things but it had also made changes of inestimable value for France, and through France for the whole world. Her people were now a nation of thinking men and women, and for a brief time at least they had seen the most humanitarian laws in operation. Throughout the Revolution the one great trouble had been that there had never been one man strong enough to secure and to hold control for any length of time. Danton had come and gone, Robespierre had risen and fallen. These reformers had come to France and to the world before the world was ready for them. They died for their ideals, but the lessons which they taught were not lost. Many of their dreams have been realized in different countries during the intervening years and the world is still following in their footsteps.

The Constitutional Assembly, the Legislative Assembly, the Commune and the Great Committee, had all ruled France. In 1795 a new form of government was installed called the Directory. The Assembly was divided into two chambers, the Council of Elders, composed of two hundred and forty members at least forty years of age, and the Council of Five Hundred, whose members were not to be less than thirty years of age. The Council

of Five Hundred drew up the laws and the Council of Elders had the power to approve or reject them. Over these two houses was a Directorate of five members, all chosen from the legislative body, and one of whom was to retire each year and a new member to be chosen in his place by the Directors themselves.

The extreme point was passed and now the pendulum was swinging back from democracy, to republicanism and beyond. The new government was controlled by the bourgeoisie, the prosperous bankers, merchants and tradespeople. Titles had been abolished and now no head could be held higher than that of the rich merchant's or banker's wife. The Revolution had made great changes in the position of many families. People who had once been poor were now enriched by public lands; nobles who had been rich were living in poverty or were pensioners at the hands of the people less unfortunate. The rich middle class people began to ape the ways of the nobles who went before them; they even surpassed their predecessors in extravagance and immorality. Never was Paris so gay, never had women dressed so lavishly. The influence of these times is still felt in fashions which recur as Directoire styles every few years.

The wives of the Directors were social leaders. They went about the streets clothed in diaphanous draperies which concealed their figures

not at all. Tuberculosis, incurred by exposure, was common among the women of wealth and fashion. They wore a close fitting pink silk garment next the skin, and diamond studded garters which could be plainly seen through their gauzy outer draperies. It is said that one lady of fashion riding in her coach through the streets of Paris was assailed by a mob of poor people who thought that she was nude.

The Directors did not live the simple lives of the Great Committee. Instead they lived in the utmost luxury. They were in addition dishonest and each one was looking for personal gain. They had charge of all foreign negotiations and no treaty was signed unless the Director who drew it up received a bribe. Talleyrand, one of the Directors, asked such a bribe of the American government and was indignantly refused. The correspondence in regard to the matter has gone down in history as the X. Y. Z. letters. No one got anything from the Directory unless they paid for it and anyone who had sufficient money could secure almost anything desired.

The prosperous middle class people were satisfied. They were now the aristocrats, but the scattered Jacobins and the Royalists were far from being content and they were constantly plotting, the former to restore the democracy of 1793, the latter to restore the monarchy. France needed a leader as never before, and at last a man was rising

into prominence who would be strong enough to dominate his associates and bring together the warring factions of the country; who possessed the personality to again weld France into a united and powerful nation.

Napoleon

THE Constitutional Assembly, prompted by Lafayette, had published the Declaration of the Rights of Man, in October, 1789.

Some of the articles read as follows:

"Men are born and remain free and equal in their rights.

"The rights are liberty, ownership of property, security and resistance to oppression. Liberty consists in being able to do anything which is not injurious to another.

"The principle of sovereignty rests in the nation.

"Law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have the right to co-operate personally or through their representatives in the formation of laws. The law should be the same for all.

"All citizens being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally admissable to all dignities and public offices according to their property and talents.

"No man can be accused, arrested, or detained in prison except in cases determined by

law, and according to the forms prescribed by law.

"No one is to be molested on account of his opinions, even those on religion, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order as provided by law. Every citizen can speak, write and publish with perfect freedom.

"The common contribution must be equally apportioned among the citizens according to their ability.

"Property being an inviolable and sacred right, no one can be deprived of it, except when the public necessity, legally certified, evidently demands it, and then only on condition of a just and previously arranged indemnity."

So before the law there was no longer any difference between Frenchmen, but these Rights of Man, accepted and acted upon in France, were not applicable to the French alone. They were a constant menace to absolutism throughout Europe and the monarchies of Europe made continuous war upon France for that very reason. When we consider her internal difficulties it is cause for wonder that France withstood these attacks.

There was born at Ajaccio in Corsica, on August 15th, 1769, a boy who was destined to change these things. One of a large middle class family, he was considered fortunate in securing admission to the French military school at Brienne.

But, as the French put it, he was "difficult." His great poverty emphasized his natural pride.

He was graduated at the age of seventeen and given the rank of sub-lieutenant of artillery. This rank he held without promotion for seven long years, but the Revolution made many opportunities and opened doors to the army man which would have been closed under the old régime. Napoleon's genius and daring and limitless ambition forced him on, and in 1795 he had attained the rank of General and had already attracted the attention of a number of those prominent in the government. He had even written a pamphlet called *The Supper of Beaucaire*, on the Jacobin doctrine, which Robespierre had published and distributed, and from time to time reports of his victories were brought back to Paris.

There was need of a strong man at the head of the National Guard at Paris, which was showing signs of leaning towards the Royalists. The general in command was removed and Barras, a Director, said: "I have the very man we want; a little Corsican officer who will not make so much fuss." Napoleon received the appointment.

The poorer people of Paris had for years been accustomed to making their wants known by mass meetings and processions which became mobs on slight provocation. Lacking confidence

in each other and fearing the accusation of being anti-republican, the leaders had never dealt firmly with these demonstrations. On the night of October 10, 1795, such a mob jammed the streets in the heart of Paris, but Napoleon, as commander of the National Guard, was prepared. The impact was short and sharp, when organization was attacked by disorganization. The mob had met its master and recognized him. The victory of the ruling powers was complete and Napoleon was no longer unknown. The Convention gave a public reception in honor of Barras and Napoleon and confirmed them in their appointments, Barras as general of the Army of the Interior and Napoleon as his second. Barras soon after resigned and left Napoleon in command.

The Directors chosen in 1796 were all men who had voted for the death of Louis XVI. The Republic was so in fear of a return to the old régime that they would not put in power any but such men as had so irrevocably allied themselves with the Revolution that they could not afford a return of the Royalists for personal reasons.

Napoleon was as yet little more than military governor of Paris. Other generals were out in the field winning victories for France, while Napoleon was quelling street riots and watching demonstrations at theaters. This was not what he wanted. He was prosperous and honored, he

moved in the best society of Paris, but he did not have the power for which he longed.

During this period he met Josephine. She was one of the beautiful women who adorned the court of the Directoire as the Pompadour, Montespan and Du Barry women had adorned the Bourbon court. Josephine was the especial protégé of Barras. Many tears have been shed for her. But like Marie Antoinette, she was selfish, extravagant and luxurious, outdoing most of the other extravagant and selfish women of the period. Also she was beautiful and Napoleon fell a victim to her charms and through the co-operation of Barras married her, and two days before the marriage received a commission as Commander-in-Chief of the army in Italy.

They were married by a civil contract and in March, 1796, Napoleon took command in Italy, leaving Josephine to enjoy the pleasures of the court of the Directory. Stories of his victories began to come back to France and his glory was paling that of the Directors in the public eye. He ceased to obey orders from home and commanded his armies as he saw fit, but his successes were so continuous that the Directors dared not make any objection. He had become the idol of the French people.

He drove the Austrians out of Italy and instead of driving the Pope out also, as the Direc-

tory desired, he left him in possession of his ancient Papal See and took from him a vast sum of money as well as hundreds of pictures, statues and manuscripts to enrich the galleries of the Louvre. He organized the Italian States, forming a number of small Republics.

Meantime the Directory in France was trying to please both Royalists and Republicans and was succeeding in neither direction. In the election of 1797 the Royalists were allowed to be represented and in consequence Royalist plots to overthrow the government were talked publicly in the cafés and in the streets. The Constitutionalists were also busy and there was constant friction among the Directors themselves.

Napoleon came home from Italy, followed by a long wagon train bringing the spoils of his many victories. Everyone whom he had conquered, from the most insignificant Italian duke to the Pope himself, had been made to contribute. Napoleon had made himself and his officers rich and had sent uncounted treasure to the profligate Directors of France. He was received everywhere with wild demonstrations of joy and admiration. Publicly he and the Directors lauded each other.

Privately he was jealous of them and they feared him. He was too young to be made a Director, which was what he wanted. Unable to get into the position he desired, he had succeeded

in placing two of his brothers in a position to be useful to him. Joseph Bonaparte and Lucien Bonaparte were both prominent men in Paris and while Napoleon was away fighting, they were at home to see that none of his triumphs went unheralded.

The Directory was so anxious to get rid of Napoleon that they sent him on a military expedition to Egypt, but Lucien and Joseph remained in Paris, both members of the Councils and both enriched by the bounty of their brother.

Napoleon conquered Egypt and might have made it a French colony, but even then there was no limit to his ambition and he pressed on across the desert into Syria, where he met defeat at Acre. But it was not Napoleon's policy to send home reports of his defeats. If these came to France at all it was through the English newspapers, and by the time they reached Paris he would have blotted them out with some new victory.

Two more Directorial elections had passed when Napoleon again returned to Paris in October, 1799. The people were by this time so dissatisfied that everyone except the Directors themselves were looking for another revolution and all eyes turned toward Napoleon. He was no longer too young. The Council of Ancients appointed him to the command of the government troops and transferred the

sittings of the Councils from Paris to St. Cloud, the first step in a plot to overthrow the Directors. Napoleon put officers of his own choosing at the head of the troops guarding the Luxembourg and the Tuileries.

Talleyrand, a member of the Council, went to Barras, who was still one of the Directors, and after telling him that Napoleon was planning to have him shot explained that two other Directors had already resigned from the Directory. He might as well follow their example. He could not stand alone and perhaps if he gave no trouble Napoleon would give him money. These statements were not true, but Barras believed and resigned. Without him the others could do nothing. They were put under arrest while they hesitated as to what steps they could take.

Napoleon then went before the Council of Ancients and pledged himself to uphold the government. The Council of Five Hundred was not so easily subdued. This was a more democratic body, still attached to the ideals of the Revolution. Lucien Bonaparte was at the time its president. They met on the afternoon of October 10th, 1799. A speech was begun in praise of the action taken by the senior body. Then a great demonstration broke forth. Demands were made to have Napoleon outlawed. His brother refused to make the motion. Napoleon himself entered and tried to

address them but they would not listen and the great general was forced to retire, but he still had his faithful soldiers. He appealed to them and called them brothers in arms. They answered with shouts of "Long live Napoleon." The troops entered the hall with bared steel and the legislators fled before them. The entire army of France was at the call of Napoleon and no one could stand before him.

Late that night Lucien Bonaparte assembled a small minority of the two Councils. The Directory was abolished and a new executive of three Consuls was created. While nominally there were three Consuls in reality there was only one, for from the first Napoleon assumed supreme dictatorship and all the machinery of government only concealed his power. He had seized the power in a lawless manner, but the people were satisfied. They did not want to return to the monarchy, but they were heartily tired of the dissolute Directory and they were weary of the constant warring of political factions. They welcomed the strong rule of the only man in France who could dominate. In the turbulent years just passed there had been many constitution makers, here was a man who could maintain one. The soldiers loved him, the common people idolized him and the middle class recognized in him a power that would restore normal conditions of life, protect them in their possessions and bring internal peace. The Con-

sulate lasted four years and in 1802 Napoleon made himself Consul for life.

One of Napoleon's earliest measures was to suppress the newspapers as far as possible, in itself positive evidence that he had in mind plans which would not bear discussion. He limited the number of papers in Paris to five and these he held in such complete control that no criticism of him or his actions was permitted. By way of compensation to the people of Paris and to thousands all over France who had come to depend upon the news in Paris journals, the official army reports were published in great numbers and distributed widely, thus supplying news of French victories to occupy minds which had grown accustomed to free thought and free discussion.

He re-established the Legion of Honor in 1802. There were various grades in this body and membership was an honor bestowed as a reward of merit on any man who achieved signal success in any line of endeavor. It might be given to an inventor, a soldier, an artist, or a writer, but the legislature opposed it because they saw in it a return to the old titles and class distinctions. Their opposition in this matter, as in others, counted for little.

The Royalists on the one hand, and the Jacobins on the other, were not entirely subdued even now and several attempts were made upon

the life of the First Consul and he was urged to "complete his work by rendering it, like his glory, immortal." In other words he was urged to allow himself to be crowned emperor. The reasons given were that he had now proven himself strong enough to rule France. No other man had proven that in three generations. If he should be killed the country would again be torn by conflicting political factions. If he were crowned emperor, his son would inherit the throne, or if he had no son the eldest son of his brother Joseph would become emperor, thus making the succession secure and the government continuous.

The senate and tribunate first voted on the matter and were almost unanimously in favor of it. Next it went to the people for approval and they also favored it with a large majority. A curious paradox is found in the opening words of the imperial constitution which states that "The government of the Republic is confided in an emperor who takes the title, Emperor of the French." This occurred in 1804, yet France remained a republic in name until 1808, when it was declared an empire, but for four years the French Republic was ruled by an emperor.

On November 30, 1803, Napoleon gained the territory of Louisiana in North America from the Spanish, and in December of the same year sold it to the United States. He was not ambitious for

colonial possessions in the New World. His eyes centered on Europe and the Orient.

Napoleon had been absolute ruler before this time in everything but form but he was now able to dispense with republican forms. The coronation took place at Notre Dame, December 2nd, 1804, with all the pomp and ceremony imaginable. Previous to the coronation a religious marriage ceremony was performed for Napoleon and Josephine, for the Pope, although he was in Paris virtually a prisoner, refused to appear at the coronation unless this were done.

Napoleon later said: "I did not usurp the crown. It was lying in the mire. I picked it up. The people placed it upon my head."

There was little that was democratic, except opportunity for all, that Napoleon brought to the government of France. There began a display of pomp, probably a great satisfaction to his personal vanity but just as probably assumed for its effect, for Napoleon knew his people. He gathered about himself a hierarchy of officers which took the place of a court nobility. His brothers were given the titles of princes. Next in rank were six imperial dignitaries, the Grand Elector, the Arch Chancellor of State, the Arch Treasurer, the Constable, the Arch Chancellor of Empire and the Grand Admiral. These six formed the Emperor's Grand Council. Next came the marshals, Berthier, Murat, Masséna,

Augereau, Lannes, Jourdan, Ney, Soult, Brune, Devout, Bessières, Moncey, Mortier and Bernadotte, the leaders of Napoleon's armies. There are no other groups of names in all history, associated together in such extremes of life, such experiences of romance and tragedy. Another name well worth remembering is that of Talleyrand who was made Grand Chamberlain and who, with Machiavelli, the Italian of an earlier age, stands for all that is slippery and crooked in diplomacy.

The severe Republican forms were done away with and a court etiquette established which in elaborateness and formality vied with that of Louis XIV. This revival led to many curious conditions, for those who surrounded Napoleon were those who had gone through his campaigns with him, men of the army who knew much of camps and little of courts and whose wives knew still less. So there were dancing lessons and lessons in deportment, and members of the old régime were welcomed because of their larger experience in these things.

In 1806 Napoleon did away with the Republican calendar and in 1808 titles of nobility were legally restored, though they had already been publicly used and acknowledged for two years previously. The emperor realized that an aristocracy was necessary in an empire but in creating his nobility he elevated those who had been of

service to him and with twisted logic maintained that by so doing he promoted democracy. He said, "My titles are a sort of civic crown, one can win them through his own efforts."

France had for years been in a constant condition of disorder. Individuals had followed their interests and daily life gone on, for people soon learn to adjust themselves to conditions even when dwelling on the slopes of a volcano, but all public and state institutions were utterly neglected. There had been so many reforms and experiments that nothing had been accomplished and nothing permitted to continue. Specie had disappeared and the paper money, issued by command of the government, was almost valueless. Taxes and customs duties were improperly assessed, collected and disbursed.

The courts of law were broken down and because of the many enactments no one knew just what the statutes were or how they should be enforced. There were few provisions for maintaining order and outlawry and brigandage were prevalent throughout the country and even in the environments of the large cities. The schools had been so many times reorganized that there was little left of them and religion and religious education were banned and only carried on in secret. The one undertaking to bring order out of this chaos must be more than a great soldier, must be able to ac-

comply larger results than the re-establishment of regal splendor at the Louvre and Fontainebleau.

Napoleon introduced constructive measures which were to make him more famous as a statesman than as a warrior. He did away with limitations of caste and party. He chose men of every political and religious belief, to serve him in the new government. His only question was to a man's ability to serve him. "I cannot create men, I must take them as I find them," he said. He recalled the émigrés to France, restored the currency and public credit. He reinstated religion and took his generals to mass at Notre Dame. He developed the country's resources and encouraged agriculture and manufacture.

There was a great mass of paper money and it was on the increase; taxes, if paid at all, were paid in depreciated paper. There was no money to pay interest on public debts and all finance was disordered and insecure. He retained the system of taxes he found in force but saw to it that taxes were honestly collected and disbursed. He stopped the issue of paper money and created the Bank of France, which had a monopoly of this issuing of paper money but was compelled to protect all its paper by a proper reserve of gold and silver. In connection with this he reorganized the customs.

The police system during the Directorate was little but a bureau of espionage. Napoleon

had his own system of spies, his secret police, but he reorganized the regular police system and made travel and life safe and ordered. Before becoming emperor he had inaugurated the system of national laws which has gone down in history as the Code Napoleon. This code was a crystallization of many of the aims of the first Revolutionists and it reconciled the few still existing monarchial laws, laws which were in reality a survival of ancient customs, and the various contradictory laws which had been passed by the various governments since the meeting of the first Constituent Assembly.

He followed the plans of the Revolutionists in making the Church and State separate and distinct institutions. He allowed the exiled priests to return but they no longer had any legal power over temporal affairs and they were required to obey the laws, as were other individuals. Justice was the same for every man, be he priest, noble or peasant.

The French jury system of the present is practically the same as that established by Napoleon. Only criminal cases are tried by jury in France. The jury consists of twelve men and a verdict of a majority of these is considered final. Whether the trial of civil cases by judge and jury, or simply by the judge, is the better way has been much discussed and many legal authorities incline to the French method, as in civil cases where the decision must be reached on the balance of prob-

abilities in one direction or another, the decision is more quickly and usually just as fairly reached by one man as by twelve, for in civil cases there is less apt to be prejudice and emotion to influence the decision, than in criminal cases.

The French judge examines prisoners and witnesses as he wishes, without the intervention of attorneys, and the accused is permitted to ask questions and make arguments and pleas, which would be entirely out of order in an English or American courtroom.

All these undertakings were placed in the hands of various commissions made up of experts in the subjects under discussion. These commissions made reports, after careful consideration of all the problems, but no action was taken on any of their recommendations until the reports had been submitted to the emperor. He had not only the vision to recognize the necessity and the force to make the readjustments but he had the wisdom to understand the requirements.

The country was reorganized on a new basis, which included some of the conditions of the old régime, some of the innovations of the Revolution, and some ideas introduced by Napoleon. The Directory of 1799 had placed the local administration of the different departments under control of ministers of Paris. Napoleon made a change which still further increased the power of the central gov-

ernment and lessened that of the elective Councils of the Departments. The powers formerly exercised by these elective bodies were now placed under the control of the prefects and sub-prefects. The elective Councils still existed, but they met only for a fortnight each year. The Municipal Councils had slightly larger powers, but the mayor was chosen by the prefect. The police of all the large cities were controlled by the central government.

During the Revolution the Church had received no support from the State, had lost its possessions and the priests had been banished. Napoleon came to an agreement with the Pope. These "Fundamental Articles" were liberal compared to the conditions imposed by the Revolution, but they were insistent upon the absolute dominance of the State. The result was that the clergy were under the control of Napoleon. When he recalled the emigrant clergy, he did not reinstate the bishops who had been in office before the Revolution. These bishops he considered too friendly with the Bourbons and proportionately dangerous. He appointed fifty bishops of his own, whom the Pope consecrated for him. These bishops appointed the lesser clergy under them, but all were compelled to take the civic oath and were governed by the prefect of the department in which they lived. All, from highest to lowest, were paid

by the State, as were the teachers in the public schools. The teachings of the Church were clearly outlined and if any prelate taught contrary to the provisions he was quickly deposed by the Pope, who, so far as France was concerned, was no more than the head of the Church organized by the emperor. Napoleon looked upon the clergy as his religious representatives. He knew that religion is the most powerful agent in the world for maintaining law and order and for teaching obedience to authority, and he proposed to harness this great force to the chariot of his ambitions.

Personally, while like Robespierre he believed in a Supreme Being, he did not believe in any particular creed or dogma. He adopted the Catholic faith because he wanted a state religion and it was the religion in which a majority of his people had been trained. It was his desire that the Pope reside in Paris a greater part of the time and his hope was to make Paris the center of the Christian world.

In his relationship to the Catholic Church he likened himself to Charlemagne, but his power was greater. He had more control over the Pope than the Pope had over him, for Napoleon was hindered in his ambition by no thought of reverence. Charlemagne had been called the secular arm of the Church; the Church in France was the religious arm of Napoleon.

His supervision went everywhere. He regulated the fees priests might charge for baptism and marriage. The charges, he argued, were not spiritual and the State should mediate between priest and layman as to the sum which was just. He did not like monasteries and nunneries and disbanded many religious orders. However, he allowed a few to remain and even permitted a few orders to be established. These orders must first obtain the consent of the government. Their aims, objects, ideals and teachings must be clearly set forth in their application for organization and if the government approved, permission was granted to found the order. Always he had some guiding reason for allowing these things.

Among the orders established under Napoleon were the Lazarists and Fathers of Foreign Missions. Napoleon said of them: "These monks will be of great service in Asia, in Africa and in America. I will send them to procure information on the state of the country. Their robe protects them while it is a cover to commercial and political designs." He regarded them as "secret diplomatic" agents and insisted that their superior reside in Paris instead of Rome so that he could be under direct supervision of the government.

Organizations which had teaching or nursing as their object were permitted because they could be made useful to the people, but he made it

plain that these privileges were granted by his favor and could be withdrawn at any time. No religious body or individual might communicate with the Pope except by consent of the government, and the Pope himself might not issue any bull or proclamation to the laity or clergy of France without first gaining the consent of the emperor.

Napoleon undertook to centralize and reorganize education in the same thorough way. The Convention had provided for primary, secondary and advanced education, but the provisions had never been generally applied and the primary schools were almost nonexistent. At first there was not money enough to carry out the plans and the emperor took control of the numerous private schools and saw to it that they complied with the provisions made for public schools. They were forbidden to teach certain studies, thus making it necessary for pupils to finish their education in the university schools. He insisted on military training and discipline.

Three things, generally overlooked, showed that Napoleon was, from our present day liberal viewpoint, unfitted to succeed. He made no efforts to carry out the plans of the Convention concerning primary education. He made no provision for the education of women. "Public education does not befit them," he said, "since they

are not called to live in public, and marriage is their sole aim and destination." He feared the power of the press and established a strict censorship over the newspapers and books. He said, "The epoch of the Revolution is ended; there is only one party in France and I shall not permit my journals to say or do anything opposed to my interests." In the same way he suppressed a work of Madame de Stael, whom he regarded as a dangerous woman "because she talks," as he put it.

Nothing was too small to escape the interest of the emperor, but he could not have assumed such absolute control of the daily lives of his people had he not possessed wonderful insight in surrounding himself with men of ability and loyalty. There were two things he demanded of those he placed in positions of trust. Personal prejudice or liking rarely entered into his appointments. He chose men who had the ability to carry out his commands and who would be loyal; their other qualifications interested him little.

Napoleon, like every great conqueror, had a desire to make his capital more magnificent, for by this means he saw a way to make his government popular and turn the thoughts of the people away from the losses of war and the paternalism of his government. He followed the Roman example in having great highways constructed to facilitate communication between all parts of the Empire.

He spent vast sums in beautifying Paris and brought to her museums the spoils of his conquests, until she became the art center of the world. Churches were repaired, monuments built, streets widened and public parks improved and enlarged. The Column Vendome was built from the bronze of cannon captured in the campaigns of 1805 and like its model, Trajan's column at Rome, commemorated national victories. The Arc du Carrousel, in the Place des Tuileries, is a copy of the Arch of Titus at Rome. It seems small and almost insignificant against the background of the great arms of the Louvre stretched on each side of it, but properly placed would be effective. The Arc de l' Etoile, constructed at the end of the Champs Elysées, is the greatest monumental work built under his direction and one of the great monumental works of the world. This is partially due to its commanding position at the summit of a long incline of many blocks, leading from the Tuileries Gardens and the Place de la Concorde; partially to the streets about it, so arranged that the principal ones radiate from the great circle in which it is placed. These essentials of location and surroundings are points in which the French can still teach the world. The Madeline, intended as a Temple of Glory, and now one of the churches of Paris, is the greatest building constructed under Napoleon.

Napoleon was just as ambitious for glory as a patron of arts and sciences as in all other directions. He established prizes in art and science and aimed to encourage artists, scientists and writers, but his insistence on personal management failed to produce the results he hoped, and while science made great progress art was moribund.

The most conspicuous figure in French literature during the First Empire was René Francois Chateaubriand. Having lost sympathy with the later developments of the Revolution, Chateaubriand left France and went on a voyage of discovery in search of the "Northwest Passage," which he did not find, but returned enriched by his travels with a wealth of imagery and imagination derived from the wild scenery of the western continent. He joined the émigrés and for some time lived in England, thus further broadening his views by association with English life and a study of English literature.

He returned to France during the rule of the First Consul and was active in assisting in the reorganization of the Church. He wrote a book on the beauties of the Christian religion, a masterpiece of literary art rather than of argument, but is better known to posterity by his romantic writing, particularly his *Atala*, or the Loves of Two Savages. In this literary curiosity we have the idyllic love of two American savages depicted with all the

delicacy and grace of a Watteau painting. Despite its exquisite language and remarkable descriptions of nature, the work makes no lasting impression because it is fundamentally untrue to life.

At this time he was a great admirer of Napoleon, but in common with many who had hailed the emperor as the deliverer of France, a closer acquaintance with his boundless ambition and ruthless methods of gaining his ends changed Chateaubriand's opinion, and in 1808 he gave offense to the emperor in an article in the newspaper *Mercure de France*, in which he made allusions to Nero which were rightly construed as meaning the emperor. The *Mercure* was temporarily suppressed, following Napoleon's policy of controlling the press.

Later Chateaubriand was forbidden to deliver his address when he was received in the Academy, because it contained bitter allusions to Napoleon. He was a politician as well as a writer, but he changed his views so rapidly that he was of little value to any faction. He translated Milton's *Paradise Lost* into French and wrote much in verse and prose. To-day his work seems unreal and impossible and is chiefly significant for the fact that it helped the transition from the classical to the romantic school of literature in France. This change came a bit earlier in England but was delayed in France by the influence of Rousseau and the painter

David, whose devotion to classicism has been mentioned and whose long life kept his work as an active influence for many years.

No one in French literature was more deferred to by contemporary writers than was Madame de Stael, and as her most important work was done during the Empire, these opinions reflect the taste of the time. Her writings are to-day unread except by students of literature and these find her work interesting, not because of its intrinsic, artistic value but because of the interpretation it gives of the period and the insight afforded into the strange mind of the writer. Her constantly renewed feud with Napoleon is a curiosity. They could no more let one another alone than could spoiled children. It is difficult to comprehend how a man who could conceive and carry out the constructive plans which he did, and could attach to himself such a variety of men with such loyalty and devotion as he unquestionably did, could be guilty of the petty meanness and trivialties which he was constantly perpetrating, always to his own detriment.

Madame de Stael's most important writing is *Corinne*, which marked the first reaction in France from the prevailing classicism in literature and art. All her writing lacks originality or deep thought. Her gift was that she could catch up the ideas which came to her from others and throw them out or reflect them vividly and clearly.

The scientific attainments of the First Empire were not notable or distinctive of that time, for all of the men working in the different branches of science had begun their researches before the time of the First Consul, so that Napoleon cannot be credited with the results. One great gain in science there was, a gain which should be debited against the Napoleonic régime rather than credited to it. The external history of the Empire is an account of an almost continuous series of wars which sent French soldiers to their deaths by hundreds of thousands and necessitated the lowering of the age limit for enlistment in the army, time after time. The hospitals were filled to overflowing and the science of medicine and surgery was tremendously developed, although at the time there was little knowledge of the causes of infection or of antiseptics. The hospitals were also vastly improved. Previous to this time it had been customary to crowd four and sometimes five patients into one bed and even now, in crowded times, two patients were sometimes put together, but gradually the single cots were adopted in all hospitals and many technical improvements made. So the things learned during the horrors of war continued as blessings after peace had been restored.

The Academy of Sciences met for the last time on the 21st of December, 1792. It had been supported and its members pensioned by the king,

and they were looked upon as part of the aristocracy, so that they received the same treatment as other aristocrats. In 1795 the Convention organized the Institute of France to "prosecute those scientific and literary labors which shall have for their end general utility and the glory of the Republic." It was made up of three classes, the exact sciences, political economy, and philosophy and literature. Part of the membership was designated by the Convention and these met and selected the others.

Napoleon, in accordance with his determination to centralize everything in himself, decreed a new constitution for the Institute in 1803, which rearranged the divisions and sections and vested in him the power to approve the election of any member. It was under the direction of Napoleon that it was decided to do away with the calendar adopted during the days of the Convention and to return to the old calendar, but the metric system, adopted under the Convention, was retained and is beyond doubt France's greatest contribution to science.

No art so clearly interprets the spirit of its time as does the French art of the Convention, the Directorate, the Consulate and the Empire. The art of the court of Versailles is typified by Watteau, followed by Boucher and Fragonard. It was an art devoted to women, women of a thoughtless and pleasure-loving court. Delicate and ex-

quisite it was, but it was also fragile and trivial and at times it was sensual.

The Convention, when it destroyed the life at Versailles, set up other standards, and what more natural in searching for a model than that they should look back to the only great republic of antiquity, that of Rome? So in painting we have the stilted classicism of David with his insistence upon heroic subjects, correct drawing based upon ancient sculpture, and his abhorrence of the things he considered commonplace.

This insistence upon a basic classicism was maintained by Ingres, 1780-1867, who was next in importance to David at the time of the Empire. He is spoken of as a painter because he colored his pictures. He is at his best in his pencil drawings, which are unrivaled. The drawing of his pictures is so wonderful that it lifts them out of mediocrity despite the poor coloring, and only in his portraits may be justly said to have painted well.

Prud'hon, 1758-1823, was the best founded of the painters of the Empire, for he freed himself from an artificial classicism by studying in Italy, particularly interesting himself in the work of Da Vinci and Correggio. While he selected classic subjects, he emphasized the play of light and shadow rather than the drawing, and in this respect his work may be remembered as the antithesis of that of Ingres.

Romanticism dawned with Gros, who chose modern subjects in spite of David's advice against such a departure. The true forebear of Nineteenth century French painting was Géricault, whose two paintings, *The Raft of the Medusa*, and *The Derby*, both now in the Louvre, show him to have been of original and daring mind and lead us to wonder what would have been the result had not death so early interrupted his work.

The classic influence was as strong in sculpture as in painting. Canova, the Italian, came dangerously near making some of his classical subjects pretty. Thorwaldsen, the Dane, confined himself largely to classical subjects, and failing to improve on the perfection of the ancients, added nothing to the advance of sculpture. Houdon, the Frenchman, did portrait sculpture of startling piquancy and sensitiveness, which has made him the most interesting sculptor of the day.

There was even less originality in architecture. The ideas of the Mansards were incorporated in most of the new buildings. The most notable public building of the time, the *Madeline*, was a frank attempt to build a Greek temple in Paris. It was so close a reproduction that it is well nigh perfect, but it is as much out of place in the streets of Paris as a French Renaissance chateau or a Gothic cathedral would be upon the Acropolis at Athens.

There was little of interest developed in music. Cherubini was in vogue. Here again the emperor asserted himself by endeavoring to influence compositions to his taste, but music is the most sensitive of the arts and will not respond to such treatment except in a negative way.

The armies of France had been continuously victorious up to the time of the beginning of the First Empire, and wherever the armies went the works of art of the vanquished were sent to Paris as booty. So even during the years of war Paris was a Mecca for students and lovers of art. The artists' quarter, or Latin Quarter, which has since been so famous in literature, was already an established fact. Here were art students from all over the world who lived in garrets and studied under David. They lived their own life in their quarter, governed themselves to a considerable extent, and were within certain limits free from police supervision.

The classic simplicity of design of the furniture and severity of color in decoration of the style known as that of the First Empire were largely due to David. Much of the furniture found in the Southern colonial homes in the United States came from France at this time or was copied from French models.

Napoleon, in the early years of his power, proved himself to have been a great statesman and

great diplomat. Had he been content with external conditions as they were when he became emperor and turned his marvelous mind to the establishment of permanent peace and the improvement of internal conditions, combined with a liberal policy, it is interesting to speculate upon what might have been the result, but his terrible ambition drove him on until he became a curse to France, a menace to Europe and the means of his own destruction.

He had diplomatically united the South German States to his cause by international marriages. His brother Jerome was married to the daughter of the Elector of Würtemberg. A niece of Josephine was married to the Grand Duke of Baden. His successes in Italy were so great that he determined to make kings of all his brothers. Joseph became king of the two Sicilies, then the Papal possessions of Benevento and Ponte Corvo were bestowed on Talleyrand and Bernadotte. This emphasized the growing hostility between the Pope and the emperor, who could not brook even a spiritual rival and was pressing his power too far. When the Pope at his behest refused to aid him in his commercial war on England, by excluding English goods from Rome, Napoleon threatened to reduce him to the rank of bishop, and devout Catholics throughout the Empire began to recognize the tyrant in the "deliverer of France."

The Duchy of Berg and the eastern part of Cleves was made into a kingdom for Murat, brother-in-law of Napoleon. Bavaria became the kingdom of his younger brother Louis. "Never cease to be a Frenchman," said Napoleon to these kings. He desired that they act as his viceroys, merely as adjuncts to France, with no more real or individual power than had been exercised by the vassal dukes of Charlemagne.

The states of Southern and Central Europe were organized into the Confederation of the Rhine, with Napoleon their real ruler in all important matters. He announced that he no longer recognized the Holy Roman Empire of which Francis I of Austria was head. Francis I acquiesced and was content to be hereditary Emperor of Austria.

Only England and Russia remained beyond the power of Napoleon. He had become far more powerful than Charlemagne, whom he liked to think he resembled, and he had begun the series of acts in which he overreached even his magnificent possibilities and brought about his own ruin.

He attempted to make separate treaties with England and Russia by which he could separate them, but Prussia discovered that in the effort to bring this about he had offered Hanover, which belonged to Prussia, as a bribe to England. This breach of faith led to a brief war in which Prussia was conquered but remained bitter and hostile.

Napoleon then forced Prussia and the German States to close their ports to all English commerce, hoping to bring England to her knees by a blockade of her trade and destroy or share her command of the seas.

Napoleon, by a series of intrigues with the royal family of Spain, which was divided against itself, succeeded in unseating the Spanish Bourbons from the throne and placing upon it his brother Joseph, King of Naples, for always Napoleon dealt with rulers and gave no thought to the wishes of the people. The result of this intrigue was twofold. The Spanish people revolted and formed an alliance with England, and Napoleon stood revealed to Europe, not as the champion of liberty, which was the pose he first assumed, but as an aggressive, unscrupulous oppressor of liberty, greedy for personal power, no matter how great the cost.

He divorced Josephine in 1810 and married Maria Louisa of Austria. This had the temporary effect of drawing France and Austria together but it was not lasting.

Russia was not a manufacturing country; she needed English commerce and would not accede to Napoleon's demand that it be prohibited. The Czar also feared Napoleon's plans for Poland. War was declared in 1812. France had lost all taste for military glory. England still controlled the commerce of the East. The French people were

using chicory for coffee and sugar was beyond the reach of all but the very rich. This gave rise to the beet sugar industry of France and after 1813 all cane sugar was forbidden as being of British origin.

Still the people mechanically responded to the call for troops and the emperor failed to recognize that the old spirit was lacking, just as he failed to recognize the power of his adversaries and the magnitude of the campaign he was undertaking. The march across Europe into the heart of Russia followed and Napoleon returned from Moscow, without an army, without allies, without health and without his old supreme faith in his star. Then came the coalition against him, the taking of Paris and the writing of the deed of abdication of Fontainebleau, on the eleventh of April, 1814; for the powers, Napoleon's own marshals and all France realized that there could be no permanent peace as long as he was on the throne. So he went to Elba, while Maria Louisa and the little King of Rome, the son for whom Napoleon had made such grandiose plans, went to Vienna.

The powers, in the Manifesto of Frankfort, said: "The powers are at war, not against France, but against the dominion, openly proclaimed, that Napoleon has exercised outside the limits of his empire." The brother of Louis XVI was crowned as Louis XVIII. The little dauphin who would have been Louis XVII was reported

dead; at least he could not be found. There have been endless discussions as to whether he really died during the Terror, or whether he was spirited away and his life spared.

Napoleon at Elba watched the establishment of a constitutional monarchy under Louis XVIII and he watched also the return of French prisoners from Russia, Germany, England and Spain. These he knew would still be loyal to him. He waited only eleven months and on the first of March, 1815, he landed in France and proceeded toward Paris. Everywhere soldiers welcomed him and hastened to join him, but there was a changed France to deal with, a France weary of war and more than ever determined to do away with despotism and to accept nothing but a satisfactory constitution and a ruler with limited power.

Realizing this, Napoleon made promises. "My will is that of the people. Its rights are my rights," he said. He professed to be content with the ancient boundaries of France, but if his own people believed him in this, Europe did not. England, Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed "that Napoleon Bonaparte had placed himself beyond civil and social relations, that as an enemy and disturber of the peace of nations he should be given over to public prosecution." Waterloo was fought and Napoleon died, a prisoner, on the island of St. Helena.

A hundred years have passed and we are only beginning to be able to make a proper estimate of the influence of Napoleon. He found France drifting and unguided, he left her crippled and in chaos. That good has come from many of his deeds is unquestionable but the good of France, or of Europe, was not the principal care of this intellectual giant, for he was cursed with an ambition and selfishness proportionate to his intellect.

THE END.

